

Tran substantiation Discuss'd,

IN

TWO PARTS.

The First, Considering the

1 vol. 7

PLEAS for it:

The Second, the

ARGUMENTS against it.

IN SEVERAL

PAPERS

That have Pass'd between

T. B. a Popish PRIEST,

AND

HENRY NEWCOME,

RECTOR of *Middleton*, in the County Pala-
tine of LANCASTER.

To which is Prefixed an Introduction in several Papers,
about the Education of Children by the same Hands.

L O N D O N:

Printed for *John Wyar* at the ROSE in St. Paul's Church-
Yard. 1705.

TRANSLATION

IN

TWO PARTS

THE FIRST CONTAINING THE

PLEAS FOR IT

THE SECOND, THE

ARGUMENTS AGAINST IT

VERBAL

P L E A S



THAT HAVE PASSED BETWEEN

T. B. A POPISH PRIEST

AND

HENRY NEWCOMB

RECTOR OF MIDDLETON, IN THE COUNTY OF LANCASHIRE

IN WHICH IS CONTAINED AN ACCOUNT OF THE SEVERAL FACTS
AND THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN BY THE SAID PRIEST

LONDON

Printed for J. B. A. at the Royal Exchange, in the Strand

DEDICATION
of Your Relations from Error, was my Design
that therein I may be Successful, and thereby
Contribute something to Your Satisfaction in
the midst of many temporal Blessings
wherewith the Divine Providence hath sur-
rounded me. All which I attribute to the
by a blessed immortality is the Constant and
Heavenly Father of
TO THE
Right Worshipful
Sir RAPHE ASHETON, Baronet.

SIR,
OF

MIDDLETON,

IN THE

County Palatine of LANCASTER.

SIR,

I Hope neither You nor any that know my
Circumstances, will Wonder to see your
Name prefixed to these Papers: Since
as Your just Zeal for the Doctrins of our Esta-
blish'd Church in Opposition to Popery, was
the Occasion both of Writing and Printing
them: So they are an Instance of my sincere
Endeavours for the Service of Your Family,
and a Specimen of my Gratitude to You for
my present Station in the Church. To Con-
firm the Faith of some, and to Recover others

DEDICATION.

of Your Relations from Error, was my Design;
that therein I may be Successful, and thereby
Contribute something to Your Satisfaction, in
the midst of those many Temporal Blessings,
wherewith the Divine Providence hath sur-
rounded You; and that all may be succeeded
by a Blessed Immortality, is the Constant and
Heartly Prayer of,

S I R,

Your very much

Middleton, July 3.
1705.

Oblig'd and Humble

Servant,

2 AP 63

Henry Newcome.

THE

T H E

P R E F A C E to the
R E A D E R.

IT may contribute towards the better Understanding of the following Papers, to give a Brief Account of the Occasion of this Controversie, and how I came to be engaged in it; the Order wherein it was carried on, the Course I have taken in managing my Part of it; together with the Motives of its Publication, and the Reason why it was no sooner.

1. As to the first, it may suffice to acquaint the Reader, That a Popish Gentleman having Marry'd the Daughter of a Protestant without his Consent; when a Portion came to be Treated of, and the latter demanded the Education of the Children by his Daughter in the Protestant Religion, the Popish Gentleman made a Challenge to bring a Friend (provided he might be safe from the Laws) to Debate any Point Controverted between us and them, not excepting Transubstantiation itself, with any Protestant Divine that should be produced.

2. This being Communicated to me by the Protestant Gentleman, I forthwith in a Letter acquainted our Right Reverend Diocesan with this Challenge, that he might nominate one to undertake it, in whose Management he could Confide: Hoping he would have waded me as unfit for such an Undertaking, as on other Accounts, so especially for a late contracted Weakness in my Sight, tho' otherwise my Station seemed to entitle me to that Burden. But his Lordship's Answer encouraging me to undertake it, provided it might be managed in Writing both to prevent Misrepresentation, and the Discouragement of a modest Disputant by a noisy Adversary, and that some particular Subject should be agreed on beforehand, either Transubstantiation or Half-Communion: I acquainted the Gentleman that had made the Challenge with these Conditions, which were accepted, and Transubstantiation agreed on for our Subject. And together with this Answer he sent me T. B's Reasons about Education, which is
the

P R E F A C E.

the first Paper in the Introduction, and in the close of which the Author undertakes to be the Champion.

3. Hereupon Feb. 1. 170¹. was Appointed for our first Meeting, with no more Witnesses than the two Gentlemen who had been the Occasion of it. There were first Read T. B's Reasons about Education, which is the first Paper in the Introduction, and my Remarks in the second Paper: And afterwards my Arguments against Transubstantiation, which are in the first Paper in the second Part, and then a Paper of his for it. After Reading, the Papers were mutually Subscrib'd and Deliver'd to be Examin'd against our next Meeting. But before we parted T. B. came to me with the Popish Gentleman, desiring his Papers again to Copy out, and promising to return them in three Days. Upon which promise I lent them, but hearing nothing from them in a Fortnight, I sent Feb. 15. for them; and at the return of my Messenger, receiv'd that which is now Printed, the first Paper in the first Part, but not the same Paper T. B. had Read at our Meeting, which I never recover'd.

Having my Answer to this ready, the second Paper in the first Part, I sent March 13. to desire a second Meeting: The Answer was, That T. B. was gone from Home, but had left some Papers; which the Gentleman brought himself March 17. containing T. B's Testimonies out of the Fathers, Paper 3. of the first Part; and his Answer to my Arguments, Paper 2. of the second Part.

Having drawn up a Vindication of the Fathers (Paper 4. Part 1.) and a Reply to T. B's Answer (Paper 3. Part 2.) I sent them by a Messenger Sept. 4. who brought me T. B's Vindication of his first Paper (Paper 5. Part 1.) And in this finding my self charged with false Citations, I demanded that we might proceed according to our first Agreement, and propos'd a Meeting in Manchester-Library, where Books might be produc'd, and that our Papers might be Read, and mutually Subscrib'd and Deliver'd as at the first. The first of these Proposals was declin'd, but after much Tergiversation, another Meeting was Consented to, where should be a Review of all our Papers before Two Protestant and Two Popish Gentlemen; which with some occasional verbal Debates, took up four Days, December 15, 16, and 27, 28. And there we agreed to Read our Papers in that Order, wherein I now Publish them.

P R E F A C E.

4. *As to my Performance, I hope the Reader will not expect any thing new on a Subject, that hath been so oft exhausted by the most able Writers. For if I Glean after the Great Usher, Morton, Cousins, Tillotson and Stillingfleet, with others that defended our Cause so well in the Reign of K. James II. and apply their Observations to the Confutation of my Adversary, I have attain'd my End, and answer'd (I doubt not) the Expectations of my Friends. And yet this farther I assure him, that I have taken nothing upon the bare Credit of those Great Men, but have consulted the Original in all material Citations. In my first Paper, besides the Translation in the Text, I transcrib'd the Original in the Margent: But finding my Adversary never gave himself that Trouble, and he for whom we writ, not pretending much to the Learned Languages; I afterward contented my self to give only a faithful Translation in English, unless where something remarkable in the Original requir'd more. And since, as I Writ, so I Publish for Use, and not for Ostentation, I have sent out my Papers without the Ornament of great Marginal Citations: Which are the less necessary, because the principal Testimonies I make use of, are well known to the Learned of both sides, who may at their Leisure compare them with the Originals.*

5. *But what can justify the Publication of these Papers, if they pretend to present the World with no new Discoveries? I answer.—1. It may be some Service to let the World see with what Assurance Papists produce their formerly baffled and exploded Arguments, as if they had never Read any Answer to them (as many of them read only their own side, and I am perswaded my Adversary, tho' he have read Mr. Arnaud, never read Mr. Claude) or thought them unanswerable.—2. They that enquire only after new Books, may hence learn what they would not seek for from former Writers, and better Hands.—3. The Boasts of the Adverse Party hath contributed no little to this Publication; of whose Triumphs, as if their Champion had been Victorious, I have receiv'd Information from several Parts, both of this and the Neighbouring County. To which add—4. That the Protestant Gentleman being inclin'd in tenderness to his Daughter, to give a Portion upon suitable Settlements, it is concluded, that unless the World see the Arguments on both sides, it will be insinuated as if his Condescensions were the Effects*

P R E F A C E.

fects of T. B's. Arguments, rather than (as in Truth they are) of natural Affection, and the Ladies Tears. Upon these Considerations, I have resolv'd to Publish these Papers, which have made some Noise in these Parts, and Many have desir'd to see, too many, to be otherwise gratify'd than from the Press.

I must confess there are some large Digressions, especially in the sixth Paper of the first Part; but I hope the Reader will observe, that I was drawn into them by my Adversary's Importunity; who hath learnt of his Party to start up a new Hare, when the old One is almost run down; and who in his former Paper takes advantage of my waving his Digressions, as if they were not only very Pertinent, but unanswerable Arguments.

6. It only remains, That I give some Account, why these Papers came out no sooner, since soon after our Meeting in December last, the Printing of them was resolv'd on. Thus then it was. My Papers being written with many Abbreviations, there was a necessity of Transcribing them; and because T. B. in a Postscript to one of his Papers excus'd his Haste, I thought it but fair to offer him the liberty of Transcribing his for the Press; which I did, allowing him to make any verbal Alterations, that should not alter the State of the Controversy between us; a Condition I have strictly observ'd my self in Transcribing mine. Upon this Offer, T. B. promis'd in a Letter to have his ready by Easter, if I would stay so long. That I agreed to, and sending in Easter Week for them, his Answer was, that they were ready, and if I would allow him another Week to Review them, he would send them. But at the end of that Week came a Letter from him with a Retraction of his former Promises, and an absolute Refusal of his Papers. This constrain'd me to delay a while longer, till I had got his Papers in my Hands Transcrib'd, in which all possible Care hath been taken to do him no Wrong; nay, all apparent literal Oversights have been rectify'd, Abbreviations writ at large, and only such Words left unalter'd, as in his Papers he always Spells contrary to our common Usage.

That God would Bless these my sincere Endeavours for the shewing of those, that are in Errour the Light of his Truth, to the end they may return into the way of Righteousness, and for the rescuing of our Holy Religion from the Scandal of this Popish Doctrine, is the hearty Prayer of

CONTENTS.

The Introduction.

- Paper I. **T.** B's Reasons, Why no Christian Parent can Consent that his Children be brought up contrary to the Judgement of his own Conscience, in Matters of Faith and Religion. Page i.
- Paper II. H. N's. Remarks upon the Reasons, Why no Christian Parent can Consent that his Children be brought up contrary to the Judgement of his own Conscience, in Matters of Faith and Religion. p. iv.
- Paper III. An Appendix to H. N's Remarks upon T. B's Reasons, &c. p. vi.
- Paper IV. T. B's Reply to Paper II. p. vii.
- Paper V. T. B's Answer to the Appendix in Paper III. p. viii.
- Paper VI. H. N's Vindication of the Appendix against Paper V. p. ix.
- Paper VII. A Vindication of H. N's Reflections on T. B's Reasons about Education, against his Answer in Paper IV. p. xi.
- Paper VIII. T. B's Rejoinder to Paper VII. p. xiii.
- Paper IX. H. N's Answer to what T. B. produces about Education in Paper VIII. p. xvii.

PART I.

- Paper I. **T.** B's first Paper for Transubstantiation, in order to give a satisfactory Account of it. Page 1.
- Paper II. H. N's Answer to T. B's first Paper, in Defence of Transubstantiation. p. 11.
Pa-

CONTENTS.

Paper III. <i>The Testimonies of the Fathers for the real and substantial Presence of our Saviour's Body and Blood, in the Blessed Eucharist.</i>	P. 35.
Paper IV. <i>An Answer to some Testimonies produced by T. B. from the Fathers of the six first Centuries, for Transubstantiation.</i>	P. 45.
Paper V. <i>T. B's Answer to H. N's Reply.</i>	P. 88.
Paper VI. <i>A Vindication of H. N's Answer to T. B's Arguments for Transubstantiation, against his Reply.</i>	P. 125.

PART II.

Paper I. O <i>F Transubstantiation by H. N.</i>	Page 1.
Paper II. <i>T. B's Answer.</i>	P. 12.
Paper III. <i>A Reply to T. B's Answer to H. N's first Paper against Transubstantiation.</i>	P. 23.

2 AP 63

THE

THE
INTRODUCTION.

Paper I.

T. B's.

REASONS
WHY NO
CHRISTIAN PARENT
Can Consent that his
CHILDREN

Be brought up contrary to the
Judgment of his own Conscience, in Mat-
ters of Faith and Religion.

TIS certainly an uncontestable Principle with all who profess Christianity, that the Duties of Honour and Obedience from Children to Parents, and of Care and Education in the true Worship of God, from Parents to Children are mutual.

Hence St. Paul having instructed Children in their Duty to Parents, proceeds immediately to Charge Parents with this Precept in regard to their Children: That they Educate 'em in Godly
a 2 Disci-

- Eph. 6. 4. Discipline and Correction, *Educate illos in Disciplina & Correctione Domini.* And he declares such Parents as neglect this Obligation worse than Infidels, *Si quis suorum & maxime Domesticorum, curam non habet fidem negavit, & est infideli deterior.*
- 1 Tim. 5. 8.

Of the Punishment of this Neglect we have a dreadful Example in the *First of Kings*, according to the *Protestant Translation*, the first of *Samuel*, in the Person of *Heli* the High Priest. An Example, which according to the Text, will ring in the Ears of all, (specially Parents) who shall ever read or hear it. In Punishment of this careless Father's Neglect in the Education of his two Sons *Ophni* and *Phineas*, an Army of God's People was routed, the Holy Ark fell into the Hands of Infidels, the two Indisciplin'd Sons were Slain, and the Criminally remiss Father, by the just Ordination of God, fell Dead from his Chair upon the sad Report.

And whereas it might have been thought, that the perpetual Honour of High-Priesthood had been settl'd upon *Heli's* Family, in Consideration of his worthy and zealous Ancestors *Aaron* and *Eleazar*; God Almighty justly rejects and abhors such a Thought with a *Now far be it from me: But who Glorifies me, him will I Glorify; and who Despise me, those shall become Ignoble.*

II. These Considerations are sufficient to move any Christian Parent to be Zealous in the Education of his Children, and to deter him from ever consenting that they be Brought up contrary to the Faith and Religion which he in his Soul and Conscience believes true: Which he values as the Evangelical Pearl, with which Heaven is purchas'd, for which all Worldly Advantages are to be laid at Stake, and which he desires to leave in the Possession of his Family, rather than the richest Inheritance.

He may reasonably hope no Pious, or considerate Friend will Urge him in this Point, since by yielding herein, he would incur the Contempt of God and Man, and expose both himself and his Family to the greatest Misfortunes.

He would incur the Contempt of God, by transgressing the Law of his Conscience, which his Maker has imprinted upon his Soul, as the glorious Reflection of his own Divine Countenance (*Signatum est super nos lumen vultus tui*) and the immediate Rule of his Actions.

He would incur the Contempt of Man, by basely betraying the dear Pledges of God's Love to him, in exposing them to Miseries which he dares not Face himself.

He would expose himself, and his Family to the greatest Misfortunes, by breaking the Reins of his Conscience, after which (as many a Man before him has done) he might run into such Disorders.

INTRODUCTION.

iii.

Disorders and Precipices as our corrupt Nature too furiously leads us to, and as may reasonably be fear'd, might become both his own, and his Posterities Ruin.

But to shew that his Soul's not deluded, nor his Conscience blind and misled, he ought always to be ready according to St. Peter's Advice, to give a satisfactory Account of his Hope, (and of the Foundation of it, his Faith) to all such as shall with a fair Intention seem to desire it. *Parati semper ad satisfactionem omniposcenti vos rationem de ea qua in vobis est spe.* And it is to be acknowledg'd with singular Respect, and Gratitude by such as are *Roman Catholicks*, that the Intention of desiring such Account cannot in any Thing seem fairer, or more Charitable than in that to prevent Noise and Prejudice to them, its rather desir'd in Writing, than in a verbal Dispute.

REASONS
WHY
CHRISTIAN PARENTS

Can Consent that his

CHILDREN

Be brought up contrary to the

SOME
of his own Conscience in Mat-
ters of Faith and Religion.

THAT the Proposition propos'd to be prov'd, in the
Terms wherein it is propos'd, is undeniably True,
That the Duties of Honour and Obedience from Children to
their Parents, and of Care and Education in the true Worship of

God from Children, are the Duties of the Christian Parent.
That there seem to be yet some Overights in the Proof
of it. For what is cited out of Timothy, That he who
will not learn, especially them of his own House, is worse than an
Infidel, is not much to the purpose. For it relates to Main-
tenance, not Education, and to the Duty of Children towards
Parents, and not of Parents towards their Children; being pro-
posed

SOME
REMARKS
 UPON THE
REASONS
 WHY NO
CHRISTIAN PARENT
 Can Consent that his
CHILDREN
 Be brought up contrary to the
 Judgment of his own Conscience, in Mat-
 ters of Faith and Religion.

1. **T**HAT the Proposition propos'd to be prov'd, in the Terms wherein it is propos'd, is unquestionably True, That the Duties of Honour and Obedience from Children to their Parents, and of Care and Education in the true Worship of God from Parents to Children, are mutual.

2. That there seem to be yet some Oversights in the Proof of it. For what is cited out of *Timothy*, That *he who provides not for his own, especially them of his own House, is worse than an Infidel*, is not much to the purpose. For it relates to Maintenance, not Education, and to the Duty of Children towards Parents, and not of Parents toward their Children; being produced

INTRODUCTION.

V.

duced to urge *Children and Grand-Children, to Maintain their Poor Verse 4. Mothers that were Widows, and not throw them on the Church.*

Another Oversight is his naming *Eleazar* among the Ancestors of *Eli*, who yet was descended from *Aaron*, not by *Eleazar* ^{1 Paral. 24. 3.} but by *Ithamar*. For *Zadock* was of *Eleazar's* Line, and *Abimelech* one of the Posterity of *Eli*, is said expressly to be of the Family of *Ithamar*.

3. That the Proposition reaches not to the present Case. It is Uncontrovertible that Parents (*i. e.* both Parents concurring) are not to Consent that their Children be brought up contrary to the Judgment of their own Conscience, in Matters of Faith and Religion. But when Parents are Disagreeing in their Sentiments about Religion, the Matter is not Uncontrovertible. The Mother's Conscience is concern'd about the Education of her Children as well as the Father's, and all that is said in that Paper may Ring in her Ears as well as in his, if she be remiss. *Timothy* owed a deal for his Education to the Care of his Grand- ^{2 Tim. 1. 5.} mother *Lois* and his Mother *Eunice*, who in bringing him up in a Religion different from his Father (for his Mother was a Jewess ^{Act. 16. 1.} that believ'd, but his Father a Greek) justifies the Grandfather's and the Mother's Endeavours in the present Case.

4. Suppose the Scene laid in another Country, and the Case thus stated, A Protestant Gentleman in France stole away a Lady of a Popish Family, and Marry'd her without her Parents Consent. Must not the Grandfather and Mother use their utmost Endeavours, that their Children may be Educated, not by the Father, but in the Mother's way? Would not the Children be taken away by force in that Country from the Protestant Parent? And if Conscience oblige Papists to such Methods where they have the Law on their side; can Protestants be suppos'd to have any Sense of Conscience or Value for their Religion, who should sit still in such a Case, and withstanding the same Advantages of the Law, suffer the Popish Father to Educate the Children in a Course (as they are verily perswaded) of dangerous Errors?

I am heartily Sorry the Case is so Perplexing, in regard to the Consciences of both Parties; and should be Glad if the debating Matters of Controversie between them, may produce an Expedient to mutual Satisfaction: Concluding in the mean time, That the Grandfather and the Mother are as much oblig'd in Conscience as the Father, to endeavour the Education of the Children in the True Worship of God.

A N

AN
APPENDIX
TO
H. N's. REMARKS
UPON
T. B's. REASONS, &c.

SINCE Mr. T. hath chosen T. B. to be the Guide of his Conscience, he ought in Faithfulness to State the Case right, which is not what a Father in *Thesi* is bound to do, but what in *Hypothesi* he may do, all Circumstances duely consider'd, Take it thus.

Mr. T.—hath Marry'd the Daughter of a *Protestant* Gentleman against his Will, after he had declar'd to him, that he would never Consent to Marry her to a *Papist*. The *Protestant* Father will not give her a Portion without his Compliance as to the Children's Education, being oblig'd in Conscience to do all he can in that Case, and the Gentleman's Estate may be much Prejudic'd for want of one. The Grandfather, if not Comply'd with, may and will Appeal to superiour Powers; and the Representation of his Case before them, may produce some Effects to the Prejudice of other *Romanists*, and awaken our *Protestant* Governours to such Methods as are us'd in *France* against *Protestants*.

It is then incumbent on T. B. to tell the Gentleman what he may do in this Case, and this must be fairly answer'd according to my stating of it in my former Paper, if he intend to Direct, and not to Perplex both his Conscience, and his Affairs.

T. B's.

T. B's.

REPLY

TO

PAPER II.

IN Answer to Objections brought against the Reasons, why no Christian Parent can consent, that any of his Children be brought up contrary to the Judgment of his own Conscience in Matters of Faith and Religion.

1. The Objection against the Proof out of the 5th of the 1st to *Timothy*, is of no force. For Care of their Families regards Parents more than Children, and what foregoes determines this Care to Widows, who have Children, and are order'd to Govern their Families, as is evident out of the Text.

2. The Objection against the Proof out of the 1st of *Kings*, is of no force. For *Eleazar* was a Collateral Ancestor of *Heb*, tho' not a Progenitor, which no Body said he ever was.

3. The Objection against a Parent, who is Supreme in his Family, is of no force. For neither Wife nor Grandfather are to answer for those, who are under another's Power, whom they have no right to controul or oppose in the Government of those, who are under his Power, and whom he is oblig'd to Educate according to the Judgment of his Conscience in Matters of Faith and Religion, as is own'd.

b

T. B's.

T. B's.

ANSWER

TO THE

APPENDIX

IN

PAPER III.

IN Answer to the Reasons I gave, why no Christian Parent can consent, That his Children be Brought up contrary to his own Judgment in Matters of Faith and Religion, its objected in a second Paper by H. N. That my Obligation was to have determin'd, not what a Father in *Thesis*, or generally speaking is bound to do; but what in *Hypothesis*, or under the hard Circumstances, as is specify'd of hazarding temporal Damage, or Persecution, he may do.

To which is reply'd, That the Law of God, which obliges Parents to Educate their Children according to the Judgment of their Consciences, being general, the Application of it to Particulars is easy: And as for the danger of temporal Damage or Persecution, tho' we are not to run upon it Imprudently; yet if it follow from doing our Duty in complying with the Law of God, especially in so important a Point as the laying of a true Foundation of Faith in the Souls of our Children, we are to support our selves with these well known Sentences: God is to be obey'd rather than Men: And happy are those who suffer Persecution for Justice sake. But 'tis hop'd no true Friend, or charitable Christian will promote the Damage or Persecution of any Man for following the Dictates of a sincere Conscience.

H. N's.

H. N's.

VINDICATION
OF THE
APPENDIX
AGAINST
PAPER V.

TO the Case in Hypothesis, T. B. says, That the general Law of God is easily applicable to Particulars, because no temporal Damages or Persecution can dispense with the Duty of a Father in so important a Case, as laying a true Foundation of Faith in the Souls of his Children, and that they are to support themselves with those well-known Sentences: God is to be Obeyed rather than Man, and Happy are they who suffer Persecution for Justice sake.

Here it is observable, That in the Case hypothetically stated, two Things were propos'd by me; one the Difficulties of obtaining a Portion without compliance, which was only hinted at; and the other (chiefly insisted on) the way how the Popish Gentleman came by his paternal Right: And that T. B. only takes Notice of the former and quite waves the latter. This then is the Case, The Popish Father got his Paternal Right by a surreptitious Marriage. The Lady's Father had a Right to dispose of his Daughter in Marriage. This Right he was Robb'd of. So that it was by Robbery (T. B. will not understand me if I do not speak plain) that the Popish Gentleman came by his Paternal

Right, and we demand Satisfaction for this great Wrong, since Restitution cannot be made. Against this *T. B.* pretends Conscience, and the Obligation of a Father to Educate his Children in the true Faith. And I appeal to the World, Whether the Great *Turk* did not once Solve a parallel Case with much more Equity. *Selimus* had Robb'd some *Persian* Merchants, some of his *Basha's* advis'd him to build an Hospital with the Spoils: But he abhorring the Thoughts of making his Injustice to Minister to his Charity, order'd a full Restitution to be made. In the Case before us, A *Protestant* Family hath been Robb'd by a *Papist* of a very valuable Treasure (such we esteem our Children) and *T. B.* advises to build up a *Popish* Family with the Spoils; whilst *H. N.* first demands Restitution or Satisfaction as far as possible; and consequently in this Debate about Education, to suppose Circumstances such as they were before the stol'n Marriage. And since in *France* and other *Popish* Countries the Grandfather's Plea in such a Case, would take Place against a *Protestant*, there is as much Reason that it should do so here in *England* against a *Papist*. If we want a Law (such as they have in *Popish* Countries) to oblige the *Popish* Father to do us this Justice, its high Time to represent to the Government this our want. And whether *T. B.* will advise the Gentleman to such Obstinacy as will force us to that Extremity, is what *H. N.* propos'd in the Case, and he wisely declines, because he knows not how to Answer. As to what he says of *Persecution*, he cannot be Ignorant how many *Martyrs* we can boast of, made such, for denying their burning Doctrin of Transubstantiation; but since the Cause makes the difference between a *Martyr* and a *Malefactor*; I see not how they can be said to suffer for Righteousness Sake, that suffer for such a monstrous Absurdity; nor for Obeying God rather than Men, who lose any thing for that late human Invention.

2 AP 63

A VIN-

VINDICATION
OF
H.N's. REFLECTIONS
ON
T.B's. REASONS
ABOUT
EDUCATION,
Against his
ANSWER
IN
PAPER the Fourth.

SINCE *T. B.* undertakes to justify two Mistakes I observ'd in his Reasons, I will Examine them a little further; tho' otherwise, as not material to the Business in Debate, I should have wai'd them.

If any Widow hath Children or Nephews, let them learn (μαρτά- 1 Tim. 5. 4.
νίσμα) to shew Piety (εὐσεβείαν) at Home, and to requite their Pa-
rents.

Now

Now I desire to know of *T. B.* why the Verb Plural *παρα-
στήσαι* ought not to agree with *Children*, rather than a *Widow*?
And how he can vindicate his *vulgar Latin* for rendering it *dis-
cat*, and *ἐκτρέβειν* by *præsse* or *regere*? I desire him further to con-
sider, with what Propriety those ancient *Widows* can be urg'd (as
his Version supposes) to a Pious Education of their Families, as
a requital of their Parents, who having been Heathens, had not
much oblig'd them by their Education. But understand it as an
Admonition to Children to provide for their Mother or Grand-
mother that was a *Widow*, all co-here very well. *Let them learn
to shew Piety* in a tender Care of their Domesticks, and thereby
requite their Parents, who in their helpless Infancy took Care of
them.

As to his reckoning of *Eleazar* with *Aaron*, among the Ance-
stors of *Eli*, it must be an Over-sight, and as such I should have
pass'd it by, but that he pretends to justify it by the Term of a
Collateral Ancestor; for if he consult *Pedigrees*, he will scarce find
it proper, when he is speaking of a Descendent from *Aaron* by
his fourth Son *Ithamar*, to call *Aaron's* other Son *Eleazar* his An-
cestor, who belongs not to *Eli's* Pedigree.

But I wonder that *T. B.* that takes Notice of these little Things,
which are nothing to the Merits of the Cause, says not one word
to the Case, as I stated it in *France*, which is absolutely necessary
to a fair Determination of it. All his Answer consists in a bold
Affirmation, that neither *Mothers* nor *Grandfathers* have any
thing to do with Children under the *Father's* Power, who is Su-
preme in his own Family: And this without either answering
the Instance, I produc'd in the Education of *Timothy*, by his Mo-
ther and Grandmother in a Religion contrary to his *Father's*; or
taking the least Notice of what is done in *France*, and other *Po-
pish* Countries, in violently taking away their Children from *Pro-
testant* Parents.

I have stated the Case more fully in an *Appendix* to my first
Remarks, and so as I hope *T. B.* will find himself oblig'd to make
some Condescensions for the accommodating of Difficulties, not
otherwise likely to be surmounted.

2 AP 63

T. B's.

T. B's.

REJOYNDER

TO

PAPER VII.

IN his Reply to T. B's. Solutions, H. N. seems first to make ^{1 Tim. 5. 4.} some Difficulty, how *μυνηνίσκων* being a Verb Plural can agree with *τις χήρα* a Noun Singular. To which is answer'd, That his Grammar might have satisfy'd him, as to this, without troubling T. B. Does not he know that Enalage's of one Number for another, as well as of one Mood or Tense for another, are usual in that Language? *Figura constructionis*, &c. Besides, ^{Gr. Gram.} had he translated the *Greek* faithfully, and put any *Widow* not a *Widow* for *τις χήρα*, he might have consider'd that *τις χήρα* is an Indefinite, implying a sort of Plurality, as if one should say if any *Widow* one or other, and consequently may agree with its Verb in Sense, tho' not in Voice, as is allow'd in all Languages. Moreover, if we had not these Rules to justify the vulgar Edition review'd by the Learned Linguist St. Jerome, and approv'd by the use of the ^{AE. 17. 13.} whole *Latin Church* for above Twelve Hundred Years, what Reason have we to Tye St. Paul to an exactness of Expression in all Things, whom the Eloquent *Athenians* call'd a *Semiverbian*, or half Language'd Man, or a Sower of Words to signify the unusualness of his Expressions according to the *Greek*, and who declares himself that he pretended not to Easibility of Discourse, but to Wisdom among the Perfect? ^{1 Cor. 2. 4.}

And

And what Wisdom would it have been after having begun with Widows, to have turn'd abruptly to Sons and Nephews, to have call'd their Mothers or Aunts House theirs, and to have order'd them to Govern it, whom in another Place he charges to Obey their Parents in all Things?

Colof. 3. 20.

There are two Things here commanded Widows by St. Paul; the first to Govern their Families, where T. B. interprets *ἐκτρέφειν* with the Vulgar, and the English Translation Printed by John Day 1574, and approv'd by Bishop Cranmer; the second to return the Kindness of their Parents: And H. N. enquires why T. B. render'd *ἐκτρέφειν* by *Praeff*, and why he makes use of returning *Heathen* Parents Kindness in their Faithless Education for an Instance of Christian Widows Obligation of a like Return to their Children, in bringing them up in the true Worship of God; two Things T. B. never mention'd nor intended. They are therefore no more than two of H. N's. *Jacks of Straw*, which he pleases himself in Thrashing to no purpose, as he thinks convenient to express himself elsewhere without any occasion.

In fine, to shew this groundless Exception is of no Service to him, does not he expressly own that the Duties of Honour and Obedience from Children to Parents, and of Christian Care and Education from Parents to Children are mutual? Must not he therefore likewise own that this Command of St. Paul wou'd concern Widow Mothers even in that it concerns their Children, if his Supposition were good; Correlatives necessarily inferring one another, as he has confess'd in this Particular, and as all must confess, who know what Correlatives are?

2dly, H. N. Quarrels with T. B's. Expressions of calling *Heli's* Great Uncle *Eleazar*, his Collateral Ancestor upon this Account, that 'tis scarce allowable in *Heraldry*, because Great Uncles belong not to their Nephews Pedigree. To which is answer'd, That several Pedigrees which T. B. has lately seen, and those drawn by good *Heralds* are sufficient to convince him of the contrary. But if it were not so, what Obligation have we in Explanatory Discourse of Scripture, to Tye our selves rigorously to Terms of *Heraldry*, any more than we have to express White, Red, and Black by *Argent*, *Gules*, and *Sables*?

As H. N. says he would have past by these two Mistakes (as he fondly would have them thought) had not T. B. vindicated them; so T. B. would not have been so large in his Vindication, had not he fear'd H. N. had trifled in these groundless Exceptions with Design to have withdrawn the Person, for whom these Things are written, from a due Consideration of St. Paul's heavy Cen-

INTRODUCTION.

27.

Censure, upon careless and indifferent Parents, and of the terrible Example of the Punishment of them attended with the sad Threats of Disgrace and Infamy from an Infallible God.

3dly. *H. N.* seems to wonder, That *T. B.* makes (as he calls it) a bold Assertion, that neither Wife nor Father-in-Law have right to controul a Christian Parent in the Government of his Children within his Power, whom he's oblig'd to Educate according to the Judgment of his Conscience in Matters of Faith and Religion, without answering his Instances of what was done in the particular of *St. Timothy*, and what's actually done in *France*. To which is answer'd, That *T. B.* thought he might safely suppose that the common Principles of Christian Morality wou'd neither have been mis-understood nor dis-own'd by his Adversary. But since he finds his Mistake, he'll endeavour to make what according to them was plain enough in the Words of his Solution, yet plainer in this legal *Syllogism*.

No Wife, or Father-in-Law have right to controul any Christian Parent, so far as to make him Sin.

But if any Christian Parent omit the Education of his Children, under his Power, in Matters of Faith and Religion according to the Judgment of his Conscience, he Sins.

Therefore no Wife or Father-in-Law have right to controul any Christian Parent so far as to make him omit the Education of his Children under his Power, in Matters of Faith and Religion according to the Judgment of his Conscience.

This *Syllogism* being in Form, if the Premises be true, the Consequence must not be deny'd. The *Major* Proposition is unquestionable, the *Minor* already granted by *H. N.* so far at least that Christian Parents cannot without Sin omit the Education of their Children in the true Worship of God (which consists in Faith and Religion) and surely he'll never pretend they have a more immediate and indispensable Rule for this, than their Consciences.

But because he seems to fancy Parities and Instances more than Principles, and well-form'd Arguments, 'tis hop'd he'll allow *T. B.* to offer this one in his turn. Suppose *H. N.* had marry'd a *Catholick* Gentleman's Daughter, would he let his Father-in-Law controul him in the Education of his Children against his Conscience? Wou'd not he rather answer that his Father-in-Law had no right to controul his own Daughter in opposition to her Husband's conscientious Will and Order, much less her Husband himself? And if his Wife shou'd offer to controul him herein, wou'd not he answer that her Duty was Obedience, wherein she

might be safer than in Tyrannizing over his Conscience, and driving him by the indispensable Rule of his Actions? Sure he wou'd not be so irreligiously Uxorious as to neglect such an Answer, nor so tamely Obedient as to be afraid of such a bold Assertion as he calls *T. B's*.

Whether the *French*, or any other Nation have Arbitrarily entrenched upon this Native Right, and done contrary to the first Principle of Charity, as they wou'd not be done by; or whether *St. Timothy's* Father judg'd his Wife's and Mother's Education good, or judging otherwise he neglected his Obligation, are Particulars which *T. B.* had no Reason to trouble himself with, after having given unquestionable Principles to resolve them by. So that he was more Over-seen in supposing *H. N.* had Abilities to understand, and Sincerity to acknowledge such Principles, than in not troubling him with the Application of them, which it seems he too favourably judg'd him able, and sincere enough to have made himself.

2 AP 63

H. N's.

H. N's
ANSWER
TO WHAT
T. B. Produces
AS
ABOUT
EDUCATION
IN
PAPER VIII.

HE begins with a Vindication of his Citation out of *Timothy*, ^{1 Tim. 5. 8.} which I had affirmed to be meant of Children maintaining their Parents, and not of Parents Education of their Children. This I prov'd from the *fourth Verse*, the vulgar Version whereof on that Account comes to be contested. I found Fault with it for rendring *μαρτυροῦν* by *Discant*, and *ἐκτρέφειν* by *Regere*. To Vindicate the former T. B. brings a learned Citation out of the *Greek Grammar*, to prove an *Enaoge* of number allowable in the *Greek Tongue*: Which Pains he might well have spared since our Dispute is not about the Propriety of *St. Paul's Greek*, but the Fidelity of the vulgar Version, which ought to have rendred the Verb Plural by *discant*, as it is in the *Greek*. Whether *τις χήρα*,

any Widow (for so I render it in my former Paper, tho' T. B. disingenuously affirms the contrary, that I only render it, a Widow) or Children is to be the nominative Case to that Verb plural, is to be determined not so much by the Rules of Grammar (which wou'd allow either) as by the design of the Apostle here, and the Scope of his Discourse, which was to give the Character of such Widows as the Church was to maintain, and such as she was not to be Burthened with. The first in v. 3. Honour (that is) Maintain and Provide for Widows that are Widows indeed, or without Children as well as Husbands, and have no Body to look after them. The latter v. 4. But if any Widow have Children or Nephews (ἐγγονα Grandchildren) she is not then quite destitute, let them learn to shew Piety at Home in Maintaining their desolate Mothers or Grand-Mothers, which is a requiting of their Parents who had provided for them in their helpless Infancy. This plain Coherence of the Apostle's Discourse, determines the Verb plural *μαρτυρίωσαν* to Children rather than to any Widow, and shews that there is no such abrupt diversion from the Subject unbecoming the Apostle's Wisdom, as T. B. would charge upon my Interpretation. My next Objection against T. B's vulgar Version was, that *ἐντρέφειν* cannot be rendred by *regere*. This T. B. says, he never mention'd nor intended. Then say I, he cannot Vindicate that Translation which hath so rendred it. For tho' St. Hierome were a great Linguist and revised the Latin Version, yet it hath had many Corruptions and Castigations since his Time, and needs more. And if any old English Translation favour this Mistake, however approv'd by Archbishop Cranmer as the best that could then be had, needed Amendment, and hath since been Corrected, which can be no just Reflection on our Translation, since the vulgar Latin hath several times been Corrected, and is not without gross Mistakes still. But did T. B. never mention or intend to defend the Version of *ἐντρέφειν* by *Regere*? Hath he then forgot the time when he undertook from Scapula and Schrevelius, thus learnedly to prove it? *Εν* signifies Bene, and *τρέφω* colo, and *colere domum* is Synonymous with *Regere* or *Praesse*? Does he not remember that when I answered, *τρέφω* signifies colo only as Synonymous to *veneror* and *adoro*, he affirm'd it signify'd colo in the utmost Latitude? When I reply'd what in the Sense of *colere arum*? He not only affirm'd it, but also asserted, That when a Greek Word was rendred by a Latin one, that Greek Word imported all the Significations of the Latin Word by which it was rendred. If T. B. pretend to have forgotten this, I have it attested by two substantial Witnesses, that this was his Discourse, which

which is sufficient to convince him of Prevarication, in affirming this a thing he *never mention'd or intended*. However I desire *T. B.* to take notice, That I never intended to render *equivocal* by *regeré*: Why then does he charge on me the Absurdity of making *St. Paul* to call *Children to Govern their Mother's Family* instead of Obeying them? When I expressly disclaim that Version, and contend that the *Apostle* calls them to shew Piety toward their desolate Mothers, which is *shewing Piety at Home*.

But allowing my Interpretation of the *Apostle*, concerning Children maintaining their destitute Parents, yet *T. B.* undertakes to prove it of no Service to me. *Because*, says he, *the Duties of Parents and Children are mutual*. And since I have granted that, I am bound to grant also, That this Text obliges Parents to Educate their Children as well as Children to Maintain their Parents; *for Correlatives necessarily infer one another*. But if my Interpretation be allowed, does it not do me some Service to have proved *T. B.* hath brought a very impertinent Citation? Suppose one should undertake to prove, That a Servant ought not to *Answer again*, or saucily Contradict his Master, and should for that purpose alledge, *Eph. 6. 9. Ye Masters forbear Threatning*. Would not *T. B.* think it a very impertinent Citation, tho' Correlatives mutually infer one another, and the Duties of Master and Servant are mutual? I know *T. B.* hates my Parities, as exposing too plainly his pretended Principles or Inferences, but I must beg his Pardon for using them sometimes, when they serve (as here) to convince him of egregious Trifling.

T. B.'s next Undertaking is to Vindicate his placing of *Eleazar* among *Eli's* Ancestors, by styling him not a Progenitor, but a collateral Ancestor. But I need no more to evince his Trifling in this Paragraph, than to repeat his Words in his first Paper: *Whereas*, says he, *it might have been thought, that the perpetual Honour of Priesthood, had been settled on Eli's Family, in consideration of his worthy and zealous Ancestors, Aaron and Eleazar, God justly rejects such a thought*.

Now its well known there were two Families descended from *Aaron*, that claimed the High-Priesthood, *viz. Eleazar's* and *Ithamar's*. *Eli* was of *Ithamar's* Family, how then might it justly be expected, That the High-Priesthood should be settled for ever in *Eli's* Family for *Eleazar's* Zeal, who was the Founder of the other Family? If *Eleazar's* Zeal were to be consider'd in the Case, it must conduce towards the outing of *Ithamar's* Family, to the hastening of *Eli's* Fall, and restoring the other House to the High-Priesthood, which for sometime it had been stript off.

So

So that whatever Heralds may say of collateral Ancestors, *Eleazar's* Zeal as a collateral Ancestor of *Eli*, is very improperly urged in this Case. Besides, tho' we Read of *Phineas's* Zeal, as contributing something toward the Settlement of the High-Priesthood in his Family, yet we Read no such thing of *Eleazar*.

So that upon this Review I leave it to the Judicious to determine, Whether *T. B.* did not begin his Reasons with two Mistakes; which I thought fit to hint at in my Remarks, that the Gentleman, for whose sake we Write, might see this mighty Champion was not Infallible, since he could Trip and Stumble in the very Threshold.

T. B.'s legal *Syllogism* comes next to be consider'd. And if we distinguish in the *Major*, between authoritative and violent Controlling and Using such prudent and modest Endeavours as becomes the Wife's Subordination to her Husband: And between controlling a Father by their own Power, and controlling him by a Power superior to his, even in his own Family, viz. That of the Civil Magistrate; if I say, we thus distinguish, the hopeful Syllogism is invalidated. For as a Christian Father ought to do what he can, that his Children be Educated in the Truth; so a Christian Mother ought in her Place to take all Opportunities to instil into them the Principles of true Faith, and to obviate the Corruption of their Judgment and Morals, by the Father's Infidelity or Heterodoxy, which was the Case of *Timothy's* Mother and Grandmother, for which they are commended. And since a Woman at Marriage subjects herself to her Husband's Authority only *in the Lord*, she no more renounces her Obligation to provide the best she can for her Children's Salvation than for her own; which the Husband's Authority cannot be suppos'd to supersede. The Grandfather likewise may and ought to Endeavour by the assistance of the Civil Power, to control a Father who would train up his Children in dangerous Errors.

But *T. B.* is resolv'd to be even with me for Perplexing him so oft, and exposing his Arguments by Parities, and thereupon enquires, *What I would do if it were my own Case.* But first I deny the Supposition, for I disapprove of two Things in the Case, as what I would never allow my self no more than justify in another, viz. *Marrying one of a different Religion*, and *Stealing a Wife* against her Parent's Consent. But secondly, Let him suppose my Case in all Circumstances the same with that under debate, and I will advise the Gentleman as I should think best to do my self. If I had stol'n the Daughter of a *Papist* in a *Popish* Country, not only without the Father's Consent, but against his Resolution

Resolution declar'd to me before-hand, that he would never Consent to Marry her to a *Protestant*: If after the Marriage my Wife's Father also thinking himself oblig'd to appeal to the Government, thereby to prevent my Children's and his Grandchildren's Education in a way that he believes to be Heresie, should by the help of the Magistrate take them out of my Hands, by procuring a Law to take the Education of my Children from me; in this Case I see not how I could be justly thought *irreligiously Uxorious* in a prudential Submission. Especially considering what is owing to my Father in Law by way of Satisfaction for the Wrong I had done him, and my surreptitious way of Usurping my paternal Right over his Grandchildren.

King *Charles* the first advis'd the Parliament to make a Law for the Education of all the Children of *Papists* in the *Protestant* Religion, as the surest way to extirpate that Heresie from among us. The wronged Grandfather may and ought to appeal to the Legislative Power for such a Law, at least in the Case of stoln Marriages with the Children of *Protestants*. So that *T. B.* ought to consider how far Satisfaction should be made to the Grandfather to stop further Proceedings, which may prove more prejudicial to the whole Party of *Romanists* in *England*, than he is aware of.

T. B. says, *The Father-in-Law hath no Right to Control* (I suppose he would have said *Countenance*) *his Daughter in opposition to her Husband's conscientious Will and Order*. But I think he hath a Right to Appeal to the Magistrate, and the Magistrate hath Power in this Case to control the Father.

But this *T. B.* Condemns in *France* and other *Popish* Countries, as an *Arbitrary Intrenchment upon the Native Right of Fathers*, and *contrary to that first Principle in doing as they would be done by*.

Here it is worth Observation how easily *T. B.* can shift Principles to serve a turn. Look into the following Papers, and we find him affirming it *Charity in the Spaniards to Compel the Americans to Christianity*, tho' that were by most bloody and inhuman Violences. But now he is tender Hearted, and Condemns the Civil Magistrate's over-ruling of a Father in the Education of his Children, as very Uncharitable. But if all the Methods used by the *Spaniards* to compel the *Americans* to Christianity were Charitable, sure if they had only taken away their Children from them, and Educated them *Christians*, tho' against their Parent's conscientious Will, this would not have been Uncharitable.

So that I conclude still it is a bold Affirmation, and not yet proved by *T. B.* *That the Father is so supreme in his Family, that*
neither

K.Ch. I Works
P. 101. Edit.
1687.

Part 1. p. 5.
§. 4.7

INTRODUCTION.

neither the Mother by her modest and pious Endeavours, nor the Grandfather by the Assistance of the Civil Powers, can have any Rights to Educate his Children contrary to his Will and Perswasion: Since the first is Countenanc'd and Justify'd by the Practice of *Lois* and *Eunice* in the Education of *Timorby*; and the other by the Practice of all *Popish* Countries, and by *T. B's* own Principle of Charity in compelling the *Americans* to be *Christians*. And I hope the Judicious and Unprejudic'd will not Censure me so severely as *T. B.* does, for want both of Ability and Sincerity, for not submitting to his Dictates; who hitherto hath neither stated the Case truly, nor made any fair Attempt toward the Solution of it; but hath only made a Noise with a general Principle, that reaches not the Case in *Hypothesi*.

And I am in hopes, That the unprejudic'd Examination of the following Papers, will produce such an happy Change in the Gentleman's Sentiments, for whom they are Written, as may accommodate all Differences, and turn his Zeal into the same Channel with his Wife's and Father-in-Law, for the Educating of his Children in the Faith of the Church of England.

2 AP 63

T. B's

T. B's First P A P E R

FOR

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

§. 1. In Order to give a satisfactory Account, let it be fixed as an unquestionable Truth, that in all Humane Actions two Things are necessary.

1. That the Power be duly disposed.

2. That the Object be sufficiently applied.

IN Natural Actions a Power by God's ordinary Concourse naturally disposed, and a natural Application of the Object are sufficient; as appears in *Humane Faith*, wherewith we easily believe, tho' we never were at *Constantinople*, that the Grand Senior *Mustapha* was deposed last Summer without any more ado than that the Proposal and Relation hereof has been made to us by sincere and unbiassed Men. But in supernatural Actions, a supernatural Concourse, and a supernatural Application of the Object are requisite, as appears no less in *Divine Faith*, wherewith we cannot believe any supernatural and revealed Truth without an extraordinary Inclination of the Heart by *Grace*, and an extraordinary Application of God's Testimony for it by *Miracle*.

§. 2. Hence those Words of our Saviour, *No Body can come to me, unless my Father draws him. Had I not done those Works, which none else has ever done, they would have no Sin, to wit, of obstinate Incredulity, upon them. The Works which I do, give Testimony of me, that the Father sent me. And St. Mark speaking of the Apostles propagating Divine Faith by their Preaching,*

B

says,

says, it was Effected, God *Co-operating with them*, and *confirming their Words with Signs and Miracles*. For being there are no natural Marks of supernatural Truth, therefore God Almighty as we may observe throughout the Scripture, has always made use of Miracles to apply and recommend them to our Acceptance: Distinguishing thereby, and giving Authority to those he Commissioned to Preach his Divine Truth.

The supernatural Doctrin therefore, which Persons thus Commissioned deliver, whether by Word of Mouth, or by Writing, in regard of our Acceptance and Acknowledgment of it, depends upon their Authority, and their Authority upon the Miracles wrought by them, the sure Credentials wherewith God Almighty confirms the Embassy he sends them upon. *Legatione pro Christo fungimur, tanquam Deo exhortante per nos.*

§. 3. Accordingly the Conversions of several Nations in several Ages have been wrought. The Historians whereof inform us, not that their respective Apostles offered them bare Words or Writings, but confirm'd their Doctrin to them by Miracles. And to deny or contradict such Historians, for Example venerable *Bede* relating the Miracles of *St. Austin* in the Conversion of us *Saxons*. *Godisfridus* relating the Miracles of *St. Bernard* in the Conversion of the *Henricians*. The King of *Portugal's* Vice-Roy upon his Prince's Commission dated to him 1536, and Examination upon Oath attesting *St. Xaverius's* Miracles in the Conversion of the *East-Indies*; *Mr. Abraham Hartwell*, and *Mr. John Pory*, Protestant Writers attesting the same; to deny, I say, or contradict such Historians out of an opinionated Prevention, or because there have been Forgeries in this kind, without equal or better Proof of History, is to commit an evident Injustice, in loading Authors possess'd of Credit and Reputation with irreligious Counterfeiting of Miracles, and that without moral Evidence for it.

Now whether we be Eye-witnesses of Miracles applying supernatural Truths to us, or we hold the Possession of them so apply'd, by an assur'd Continuance, our Faith is equally secur'd. Nor are those who have not seen and yet believed, less Happy than those who have seen and believ'd. *Beati qui non viderunt, & crediderunt.*

§. 4. And that *Roman Catholics* hold such Possession of them by an assur'd Continuance is evident,

First,

Part I. for Transubstantiation.

3

First, From the universal Agreement of the visible Church at the first Appearance and Disturbance of all Separatists, declaring them Innovators and Transgressors of the Apostles Doctrin. To shew this in Reference to the Point insisted upon, to which I am limited in the Account at present desired, the real and substantial Presence of our Saviour under the species of Bread and Wine in the Blessed Eucharist.

§. 5. At the Appearance of *Berengarius*, opposing openly this Point, in the Eleventh Age, the visible Church, assembled in Five Councils, three at *Rome*, one at *Verceils*, and one at *Tours*, the Continuance of this revealed Truth from the Apostles was publickly and solemnly declared: The tacit Consent of the *Greecian* and *Eastern* Churches then differing in other Matters from the *Western*, not offering to vindicate *Berengarius*, whose Condemnation had made such a Noise, is reasonably supposed: Five of the most eminent Writers of their Time, *Adelman*, *Hugh* Bishop of *Langus*, *Durand*, *Guitmund*, and *Lanfrank* afterward Archbishop of *Canterbury*, objecting to *Berengarius*, that he had opposed herein the Sentiments and Belief of the whole Christian World, is evident in their Writings; the two last Challenging him to shew a *Greecian* or an *Armenian*, or any Town or Hamlet, where his Doctrin was ever profess'd. And *Berengarius's* Insufficiency manifested by his Silence, by his Abjuration and by his Repentance.

§. 6. Here I appeal to the Conscience of any serious Man, whether or no all and every one of the well-meaning Laity, reasonably supposed many Millions, which made up the diffusive *Western* Church under these Councils of their Bishops so Circumstanced, as I have mention'd, could prudently and conscientiously refuse the Submission of their Judgment to them in this Point? If the Question be wav'd, and it be alledg'd that they ought to have examin'd the Scriptures and Fathers. 'Tis answer'd that those were weigh'd by their Bishops plac'd in the Government of the Church by the Holy Ghost, more learned and better versed in the Scriptures and Fathers, than they were. *Berengarius's* Arguments out of them were heard, and his Sentiments condemn'd by them. Were they to have followed his Judgment? He had abjur'd it himself. Were they to have followed his Adherents? They were so few, vile and infamous according to *Durand* and *Lanfrank*, that we do not find that either *Berengarius* thought them worth mentioning, or Historians worth naming. Were they to have maintain'd their own Judgment

AB. 20. 13.

Rom. 12. 1.

1 Tim. 6. 2.
v. 4.

in Scriptures and Fathers against all their visible Superiors? This would have been not only contrary to the rational Obedience prescrib'd by the Apostle, but all Church-Government in the World, and to humane Modesty and Prudence it self. One of these two Things therefore inevitably follows; either that the sweet and all-seeing Providence of God, who would have all Men sav'd, permitted an irresistible Authority to over-rule Millions of well-meaning People, following the Rules of Modesty, Prudence and rational Obedience into a superstitious Belief, and idolatrous Worship according to our Adversaries; Or that *Berengarius* was an Innovator, and these Councils declared the continued Doctrin of the Apostles in the real and substantial Presence of our Blessed Saviour in the Holy Eucharist. The first cannot be thought of without Horror; the second therefore is, undeniably true.

§. 7. But being the Agreement of the *Grecian* and Oriental Churches to these Councils, is hitherto only gathered from their tacit Consent and *Guilmund's* and *Lanfrank's* Challenge; an Hundred Years after *Berengarius's* Disturbance conven'd the great *Lateran* Council consisting of 412 Bishops, and 70 Archbishops, in which were present in Person the Patriarch of *Constantinople* and *Jerusalem*, and the Substitutes of the Patriarch of *Antioch* *Episcopus Antheradensis*, and of *Alexandria Germanus*, his Deacon: Now this Council instead of Reversing, declar'd for a substantial Conversion in the said Mystery.

§. 8. Two Hundred Years after this the Council of *Florence* declar'd likewise for the same, in the Articles of Instruction to the *Jacobines* and *Armenians* in those Words; By the virtue of *Christ's* Words are chang'd the substance of Bread into *Christ's* Body, and the substance of Wine into his Blood. *Ipsum verborum Christi virtute substantia panis in corpus Christi, & substantia vini in sanguinem convertuntur.*

§. 9. Upon *Luther* and *Zuinglius's* appearance and opposition the Council of *Trent* declared the same. Two Synods of the Oriental Church, one held under *Cyril ab Iberia*, A. D. 1639, where were present the Patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Jerusalem*, and 23 Bishops; the other under *Parthenius* his Successor, A. D. 1642, wherein were present 25 Bishops, and among them the Metropolitan of *Muscovy*. These Synods declar'd the same.

§. 10. If

§. 10. If this universal Agreement of the Christian World be not sufficient to assure the Continuance of the Apostles Doctrin in this Point, what is? If so many great and general Councils be not the Supreme visible Authority and Court of Judicature, appealable to, and to be heard under pain of being treated as an Heathen or Publican, where is it to be found? What Councils more full of great Prelats, more unquestionably succeeding the Apostles ever decreed the contrary?

§. 11. No equitable Judge or incorrupted Jury will give a Sentence or Verdict against a Person in Possession, and pleading an uncontradicted Prescription for several Ages from the unquestionable Title of an honourable Ancestor, especially against the Prejudice of a superior Court. What Authority then can Reverse the *Roman Catholicks* Title of continu'd Possession in this Point, assur'd to them by such Councils as are here alledged? Ought not that great Lawyer's and Controvertist's Plea for them take Place, I have an ancient Possession, I have a precedent Possession, *Olim possideo, prior possideo?* Ought not that most rational *Tert. Prescrip.* Principle of *St. Austin* to secure them? *Quod Universa tenet Ecclesia, nec a Conciliis institutum, sed semper est retentum, non nisi auctoritate Apostolica traditum rectissime creditur.*

§. 12. That *Roman Catholicks* hold possession of the same revealed Truth by an assur'd Continuance from the Apostles, is evident,

2. Secondly, *From the Succession of all the Bishops and Pastors of the Church:* In that none of them are found in History to have been complained of by their Flock for teaching in this Point contrary to the Instructions of their Predecessors. We cannot but suppose, that in every Diocess, in every Parish there were some who zealously observed what they had learn'd concerning this great *Practical* and *Essential* Mystery of their Religion. Is it possible that none of them should take notice, and complain of a Successor Preaching contrary to his Predecessor in every Diocess or Parish? Is it possible that none in any Diocess or Parish, of the whole Christian World, should ever have been found to have done it?

§. 13. That *Roman Catholicks* hold such possession of the same revealed Truth by an assur'd continuance from the Apostles, is evident,

3. Thirdly,

3. Thirdly, *From a necessary Supposition in their Adversaries Sentiment, out of which follow unavoidably such Absurdities, as are abhorrent to Common Sense.* The Supposition is this, If there was a Change from the Non-belief of the real and substantial Presence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist, to the Belief of it; such Change either happened altogether, or by degrees beginning from one or some few, encreasing to equality, and so to an universal Possession. To say it happened altogether, is as much as to say, that all Christians spread over the whole World, having never before believed the real and substantial Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, began to believe it all at once, or that they fell asleep *Lutherans* or *Zuinglians*, and awakened *Roman Catholics*, without remembring or ever mentioning how and when it happened. This is so ridiculous, that it is not worth refuting. To say it happened by degrees, is as much as to say, that all Bishops and Pastors must have been without Eyes, not to have perceived a superstitious, and idolatrous Worship, as our Adversaries maintain, gaining Ground upon them: They must have been unconcerned all the World over for a Religion, which had stood so many Persecutions, for which so many Thousands, nay Millions of Martyrs had laid down their Lives; seeing they let it degenerate into Superstition and Idolatry, as is pretended, without ever opening their Mouths in the least Contradiction.

§ 14. The belief of God being made Man for the Salvation of Man, having the opposition of Sense and Reason, and the prevention of Mankind to overcome, made a prodigious Noise, and raised the whole World to withstand it; and could not be established without infinite Preaching, innumerable Books, Disputes, Miracles, and a Sea of Blood: And can we believe that the Faith of Christ's corporal and substantial Presence in Thousands of Places at once, of his being managed by the Hands of his Priests, and of his entring into the Mouths, and Breasts of his faithful People, finding the Church in a contrary Perswasion, and being accompanied neither with Miracles nor Disputes, should nevertheless be received over all the Earth, without any memorable Opposition or Contradiction, so far that neither the first Author of such Belief, nor the encrease of it, should be so much as mentioned in History, or complained of to any Bishop or Council?

§ 15. Experience assures us, that far less Matters were at all times carefully taken notice of, and zealously opposed. And must

Part I. for Transubstantiation.

7

must we suppose this great Capital and Essential Point, was let pass in Silence and without Regard? This would be a Madness contrary to Experience, and Abhorrent to common Sense. What would it then be to lay ones Soul and Eternal Salvation upon it? And the case is clear, That from the Apostles Time to *Berengarius's*, 'tis not to be found in any Historian, that ever so much as one Person was accused to his Bishop, or any Council for setting up, or offering to Propagate the Belief of the real and substantial Presence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist; nor that any Bishop or Council ever Condemned so much as one Man for it, tho' our Adversaries have the Century-Writers of *Magdeburg*, and we *Baronius*, who informs us fully of the Writers and Transactions of all intervening Ages.

§ 16. That *Roman Catholicks* hold possession of the same revealed Truth, by an assured Continuance from the Apostles, is Evident,

4. Fourthly, From the Scriptures which the Holy Church Authorized, as I have signified, by Miracles, has delivered to us as the written Word of God, and as such we Receive and Reverence. But then we must not believe the Church faithful in delivering the Scriptures to us, and unfaithful in delivering the Sense of them: Lest hereby we destroy the first Belief by the second. Nor are we to acknowledge the Scriptures only from the Church, and the Church only from the Scriptures, lest by stripping both of Authority in themselves, we should make each incapable of giving Credit to the other, and so run our selves giddy in a Circle without either Inlets or Outlets.

§ 17. We therefore receive the Scriptures as the written Word of God, from the Church authorized in her first Plantation by Miracles, and perpetuated to us by an uninterrupted Continuance of her Doctrin. According to that of *St. Austin*, I should not believe the Gospel, unless I were moved thereto by the Authority of the Catholick Church, *Evangelia non crederem nisi me Ecclesia Catholica moveret Autoritas*. And as we believe the Scriptures for the Churches Authority, so we believe the Sense of them for the same, according to the same Father. Then we hold the Truth of the Scriptures, when we do what pleases the Universal Church. *Tunc Scripturarum a nobis tenetur veritas, cum id facimus quod universa placuit Ecclesia*.

*Contra Ep.
Fund. c. 5.*

§ 18. The

Tertull. Praef.
c. 30.
Jerom. tom. 3.
Adver. Lucif.

§ 18. The reason hereof is, because otherwise the written Word and Revelation of God to us, would be uncertain, some Places of the Scripture considered in themselves alone, being hard to be Understood and Disputable. For which reason the Learned *Tertullian* and *St. Jerome* are against allowing all such as refuse the Church's Interpretation to Dispute out of the Scriptures. *Ergo non ad Scripturas provocandum. Nec sibi blandiantur, si de Scripturarum versiculis videntur sibi aliqua affirmare, quod dicunt, cum & Diabolus de Scripturis aliqua sit locutus, & Scriptura non in legendo sed in intelligendo consistunt.*

§ 19. Nevertheless, other Fathers and Doctors of a less rigid Temper, have frequently against their Adversaries, who refusing the Church's Authority, have own'd the Scriptures, made use of plain and indisputable Texts against them, as Arguments granted and *ad hominem*; and have likewise interpreted Difficult, and in themselves disputable Texts, as making nothing for them, but more against them.

§ 20. In imitation therefore of such less rigid Fathers, to make use of two plain and indisputable Texts.

Matth. 16, 18,
and c. 28, 20.
Jo. 14, 18.
— c. 6. 13.

First, it is clear, That the *Gates of Hell* shall never prevail against the Church of Christ: With which he will remain to the end of the World; to which he has sent the *Holy Ghost*, to continue with her for ever, and Teach her all Truth. But if Christ be not really and substantially present in the Blessed Eucharist, the *Gates of Hell* at the appearance of *Berengarius* in the time of the Councils of *Rome*, *Verceils* and *Tours*, and in the time of the great *Lateran* Council, and of the Council of *Florence*, had prevail'd against her; Christ had broken his Promise, and the *Holy Ghost* had fail'd in Teaching her all Truth. For certainly if ever the Church was fully Represented and Acknowledg'd, it was in the times of those Councils.

§ 21. Secondly, 'Tis clear, that it was promis'd to the Church of Christ, that she should convert many Heathenish and Unbelieving Kings and Nations. *Ambulabunt gentes in lumine tuo, & reges in splendore ortus tui. — Mirabitur & dilatabitur cor tuum, quando conversa fuerit ad te multitudo maris, fortitudo gentium venerit tibi* This Honour and Privilege is peculiar to her, her Adversaries can lay no just Claim to it: Their Business, as *Tertullian* excellently observes, being not to Convert the Unfaithful, but to Per-

Part I. for Transubstantiation.

Pervert the Faithful. Negotium est illis non Eshnices convertendi, Tertul. Praef. sed nostros evertendi. But that part of those Unbelieving Kings and Nations which has been Converted to *Christianism* within these last Five Hundred Years, had been converted to the Belief of Christ's real and substantial Presence in the Blessed Eucharist. Therefore this Belief is the same that was planted in Christ's Church by his Apostles.

§ 22. Now to put this Question to our Adversaries concerning these Conversions, and to draw Matters to as narrow a compass as we can, concerning particularly those wrought by St. *Francis Xavierius*: Were they wrought by Miracles according to the abovementioned Catholick and Protestant Testimonies, or without Miracles? If by Miracles, then the Truths which were taught in them, among which that of the real and substantial Presence is one of the most Capital and Essential, have God's great Seal upon them, whereby they may be known for his. If without Miracles, that admirable and convincing Thought of St. *Austin's* must take place. That if the *Indian* World had been brought to believe things elevated so far above their natural Comprehension as Christian Faith teaches to practise, so difficult Things to their opposite Inclinations as Christian Charity prescribes, to expect things so far above their Imaginations as Christian-hope proposes, without Miracles, it would have been the greatest of all Miracles. *Effect autem omnibus Signis mirabilibus, si ad credendum tam ardua, ad operandum tam difficilia, & ad sperandum tam alta, mundus absque mirabilibus signis inductus fuisset.*

§ 23. To come now to the Words of Institution of this Holy Sacrament. If taken in the Sense and Interpretation of the Church, they prove the real and substantial Presence; there never having been any legal and general Council representing the Church defining in this Matter, but what understood them as a standing Rule of this Truth from the Apostles Time. And if we allow Separatists to dispute, and consider them alone in themselves, they make more against them than for them. 1. Because the most obvious and natural Sense of the Words (which are to be followed unless there be obliging Reasons for the contrary, which were never as yet shewn) makes for the real and substantial Presence. 2. This Sense was most proper for our Saviour as a Testator, who therein made his last Will and Testament, which ought to be done in the proper and literal Sense of Words. 3. It was most proper for him as a Master and Teacher, who had made Friends of his Disciples; and therefore was us'd to speak plain to them, and concealed nothing from them, even in lesser Matters, but usually Interpreted to them in proper terms, what

at other times he had spoken in Figure and Parable. But 4ly, Above all it was most conformable to the Designs and Intentions of God, as they are gathered out of his Holy Word: Who in the figurative Sacrifices of the *Old Law*, ordained that his People should Eat of the Sacrifice, that thereby they might partake of the Benefit of it. Therefore the same was to be done in the *New Law*, that the Figure might be fulfilled and Truth succeed. This is what St. Paul sufficiently imparts to us in these Words. Consider the People of Israel according to the Flesh, Do not those that partake of the Altar, Eat of the Sacrifice? Conformably to which he likewise says, *The Blessed Chalice which we bless, Is it not a Communication of Christ's Blood? And the Bread which we break, Is it not a Participation of our Lord's Body?*

1 Cor. 10. 16.

§ 24. That Roman Catholicks hold Possession of the same revealed Truth, by an assured Continuance from the Apostles, is evident,

Fifthly, From the Testimonies of the most eminent Fathers and Doctors of the Church, in their respective Ages. In which, because this was a Mystery they endeavoured to conceal from Infidels and Catechumens, according to St. Arhanasius, *Apologia* 2. St. Cyril Hier. *Chateches.* 6. St. Epiph. *Heres.* 42. St. Basil l. de Sp. sancto. St. Ambr. *de init.* c. 1. &c. Therefore upon some Occasions they purposely spoke obscurely. But Truth is not to be sought in the Darkness of their obscure Expressions, but in the Light of their clear ones. Out of an innumerable Multitude of such, I'll chuse a few (an equal number, to which I desire you to observe in your Objections, to prevent endless Trouble) to prove my Intent. The next Week I'll prepare those Testimonies, being to go abroad this; and afterward Answer your Objections.

T. B.

H. N's

H. N's. ANSWER

TO

T. B's First PAPER in Defence

OF

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

§ 1. **I**N the first place it ought to be remembered, as I am persuaded it cannot be forgotten by Mr. T. that after T. B. had Signed and Delivered to me two Papers, viz. *His Reasons about Education, and his Arguments for Transubstantiation*; I upon his and Mr. T's Request, and both their Promise of returning them in three or four Days, lent them him to Copy out: But neither of those two Papers are returned to me. If the Reasons for Education be a true Copy of that Signed at our first Meeting (which I am not sure of) the latter is no Copy at all, but another Paper: Which how consistent with Integrity let the World judge. Perhaps the second Paper signed by T. B. at our Meeting, was writ loosely and carelessly (as I judged at the Reading of it) and the Author on a review, thought he could mend it, yet after Signing and Delivering, it being my Paper, he ought to have asked my Consent, and I should perhaps as freely have granted that as I lent both. For I am not sorry to see this is more elaborate, and makes some better Efforts for the support of a Cause, which needs all that can be had.

§ 2. In Answer to what is alledged in the preceding Paper, I will first give a short historical Account of Matters of Fact related therein confusedly, and only in general, and then consider every thing that looks like an Argument.

First, I will trace down the History of Transubstantiation from the first starting of it to the eleventh Century, wherein our Author finds the Church of Rome in possession of this Doctrine, that it may appear how she came by it, which I judge the most proper way to set the Matter in a true light.

Iren. l. 1. c. 9.

§ 3. I begin then with *Irenaeus* who flourished *A. D.* 160. He gives us an Account of one *Marcus*, an Arch-Heretick, an Astrologer and a Conjuror, who the better to delude his Followers, pretending to Consecrate Cups filled with Wine, and extending the Words of Invocation to a great length, made them to appear of a Purple or Red Colour, that it might be thought, that the Grace which is above all Things, did distill the Blood thereof into the Cups upon his Invocation.

Ibid. c. 12.

τὸς ἀντιδέν
ταρρυίας.

Pasch. de corp.
& sang. Dom.
c. 14.

The same Father also out of an ancient Author gives us the Character of this Mark, and among other things, that the Devil had employed him as the forerunner of Antichristian-Craft. And it is to be observed, that after this Precedent it fell out, That to inveigle the People into a gross conceit of Christ's carnal Presence in the Eucharist, such Delusions as these were practised in After-ages. *Paschasius Radbertus* spends one Chapter on that point, that Christ in the Sacrament oft shew'd himself in a visible Shape, either in the form of a Lamb, or the Colour of Flesh and Blood, that what lay hid in a Mystery, might to them that yet doubted, be made manifest in a Miracle. This of *Paschasius* I mention as an Impletion of the Prediction in *Irenaeus* about Mark's being a fore-runner of such juggling Tricks. Juggling-Tricks, I say, for I may venture to call them so, since *Alexander of Hales* confesses them to be sometimes by the procurement of Men, and perhaps by the Operation of the Devil.

Alex. Hal.
Sum. Theol. pt.
4ta. q. 11.
Memb. 2. Art.
4. Sect. 3.

§ 4. Next to the Impostor Mark, I find all of Transubstantiation, except the Name, among some Hereticks in the fifth Century, against whom the Orthodox Fathers dispute. I will instance only in St. Chrysostome, Theodoret and Pope Gelasius, referring only to some others in latter Centuries to avoid tediousness.

Du Pin Hist.
Ecc. Vol. 2.
P. 32.

§ 5. I begin with St. Chrysostome in his Epistle to *Casarius*, which tho' for some time suspected for a Forgery of P. Martyr, is at length (tho' we have only the Latin Translation entire) allowed by *Du Pin* to be St. Chrysostome's, and to breath a deal of his Eloquence. The same *du Pin* also tells us, That by this Letter it appears, That *Casarius* admired a Book that taught in Jesus Christ, such an Union or Mixture of Humanity with Divinity, as made but one Nature. St. Chrysostome tells him, that this was the Error of *Apollonarius*, *Arius*, *Sabellius* and *Manichaeus*, about the Incarnation of Jesus Christ: And to inform him better, he bids him to take Notice, That there were two Natures in Christ distinct

distinct and without Confusion, tho' united together in the same Person. To explain this Truth, he alledges the Example of the Eucharist in these Words, *As before the Bread is Consecrated, we call it Bread; but after the divine Grace hath Consecrated it by the Ministry of the Priest, it is freed from the Name of Bread, and honoured with the Name of the Lord's Body, tho' the Nature of the Bread remaineth in it; and as we do not reach two Bodies, but one Body of the Son; so we ought to say, that the divine Nature being united to the Human, makes but one Christ and one Person.* From this Passage it is clear, that St. Chrysostome believed the Nature of Bread to remain after Consecration; but it does not appear hence that the Hereticks thought the contrary: But that they did, and that this is the reason why St. Chrysostome uses this Comparison of the Eucharist, is probable.

§ 6. From Theodoret in his second Dialogue, wherein the Discourse is managed between Eranista and Orthodoxus. The first for the Eutychians, says, *As the Symbols of our Lord's Body and Blood are one thing before the Invocation of the Priest, and after that are changed and become other Things: So also the Body of our Lord after Ascension, is changed into the Divine Substance and Nature.* This was the Heretick's Argument, and in it he talks just like a Patron of Transubstantiation. But Orthodoxus answers him thus, *Thou art taken in thine own Net, for neither do the Symbols or mystical Signs after Sanctification recede from their own Nature, but remain in their former Substance, Form and Species, and may be seen and touched such as they were before.* Whence it is manifest, that the Heretick here in the point of Transubstantiation, is a Papist, and the Orthodox Father a Protestant; whose Opinion that it may be more clearly evident, I will recite a Passage against the Hereticks out of Theodoret's first Dialogue. Orthod. *In delivering the Mysteries, he called the Bread his Body, and the Cup his Blood.* Eranist. *So he called them.* Ortho. *Moreover his natural Body was called a Body, and his Blood, Blood.* Eran. *It is Confessed.* Ortho. *But our Saviour changed the Names, and to his Body gave the Name of the Symbole, and to the Symbole the Name of his Body. So having called himself a Vine, he calls the Symboles his Blood. The Symbole then was his Blood, just as he was a Vine, which sure was not by a substantial Change.* Eran. *This being true, I desire to know the cause of this change of Names.* Ortho. *The Design is manifest to those that are initiated in divine Matters: For he would have those that partake of the Divine Mysteries, not to rest in the nature of Things seen, but by the change of Names, to believe the Change which is made by Grace. For he that calls his natural Body, Wheat and Bread, and again named himself the Vine, the same honoured the visible Symboles* by

Etiams natura panis in ipso permansit.

A. 440.
Theod. Dial.
l. 2. p. 84, 85.
Paris. 1642.

Μίμνῃ γὰρ ἐν τῇ τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος.

(a) Οὐ ᾤον· by the Name of his Body and Blood: (a) Not changing the Nature,
 σὺν μέλει· but adding Grace to Nature.

§. 7. To this Father, I will add the Testimony of Pope Gela-
sius against the same Hereticks (b) Surely (says he) the Sacraments
which we receive of the Body and Blood of Christ, are a divine Thing ;

A. D. 476. *that so by them we are made Partakers of the divine Nature, and (c)*
(b) *Adversary* *yet it confesseth not to be the Substance and Nature of Bread and Wine.*

And certainly the Image and Resemblance of Christ's Body and Blood, are celebrated in the Actions of the Mysteries. It is therefore suffi-

Christo, in Bi-ently evident to us, that we must think the same in our Lord Christ
blioth. patrum himself, as we profess, Celebrate and Receive in this his Image, that

as through the Efficacy of the Holy Spirit, they pass into a Divine Sub-
stance, remaining still in the propriety of their own Nature; so does the

(c) Et tamen principal Mystery, whose Efficacy and Virtue they truly represent to us, esse non definit From which properly remaining, it is manifest, that Christ is one, be-

cause they demonstrate him to remain compleat and true. Which arguing if it be of any force against the *Eurychians*, it must be upon-

answerable against Transubstantiation. And I hope, T. B. will give more than common deference to the Authority of a Pope.

For after due Consideration of *Bellarmino* and *Baronius's* Reasons to the contrary, *Du Pin* allows this Author to be Pope *Gelasius* and

not *Gelasius Cyzicenus*, wherein he follows *Labbe*, *Spondanus* and other Popish Doctors.

§. 8. I might to these add the Testimony of *Ephraim*, Patriarch of *Antioch*, in the sixth Century, against the same Hereticks.

Concil. Nic.
2. 476. tom. 2

2 *Act. B. rom.* 3. to avoid tediousness, I do not bear to multiply Authorities after sufficient have been produced. *Orthodox Faith: a Protest*
Edit. Rom. p. 600. I shall therefore go on to the eighth Century, wherein I

§. 9. I shall therefore go on to the eighth Century, wherein I find a Synod at *Constantinople* of 338 Bishops, opposing the Idolatry of that time, and maintaining that Christ chose no other

Shape or Type under Heaven to represent his Incarnation, but the Sacrament: which he delivered to his Ministers for a Type and

the Sacrament; which he delivered to his Ministers for a Type and most effectual Commemoration thereof, commanding the Substance of Bread to be offered, which did not any way resemble the

stance of Bread to be offered, which did not any way resemble the form of a Man, that so no Occasion might be given of bringing in Idolatry. Which Bread, these Fathers declared to be the Body

in Idolatry: Which Bread these Fathers declared to be the Body of Christ, not by Nature, but as an holy and true Image of his

4-287. S. 10. Not long after was assembled the second Council of

Nice to re-establish Image Worship, which the Fathers at Constantinople had condemned; and to thwart them, Epiphanius a

Deacon confidently affirms, That *none of the Apostles or Fathers did ever call the Sacrament an Image of the Body of Christ after*

Con-

Consecration, tho' they may before. How truly, I refer to my first Paper against Transubstantiation, wherein I shew that in St. Basil's Liturgy it is called after the Words of Consecration *Antitypes*, or correspondent Types of Christ's Body and Blood. But after Consecration, says Epiphanius, they are called and are believed to be the Body and Blood of Christ properly. This was such a bold Touch of this Deacon, that in the Roman Edition of this Council, the Editor corrects it, and grants in the Margent that after Consecration the Elements were called Antitypes.

§. 11. So that it is here to be observed, that these Establishers of Image Worship first attempted to alter the current Language of the Church for near 800 Years in denying the consecrated Symbols to be the Image of Christ.

§. 12. And here Bellarmine's Observation may be taken notice of, that none of the ancient Writers against Heresies, ever took notice of any as Heretical in this Point of Transubstantiation. For they were so far from that, that they charged with Error what the Eutychians taught, which look'd like Transubstantiation, and the current Language of the Church was against it, till the Council of Nice: For calling the consecrated Symboles an Image of Christ, we must conclude they never thought them his Body in the gross and carnal Sense of Transubstantiation. For then they could not be his Image, unless you can reconcile it to Sense, that the Thing it self is the Image of it self.

§. 13. Having here seen the first occasion of bringing in the Doctrine of a corporal Presence into the Greek Church, I come now to Paschasius Radbertus, first a Monk, and afterward Abbot of Corbey, who broach'd it first in the Latin Church. This I do not expect to be believed on my bare Word, but hope Bellarmine's Testimony will not be rejected, who says, This Author was the first, who seriously and copiously writ concerning the Truth of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist. He adds, That Paschasius's Book was writ against Bertram, a great Mistake in Chronology, as I shall shew hereafter.

§. 14. Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz, a Person of the most eminent Character in that Age, both for Learning and Piety opposes him, and charges him with Novelty in his Epistle to Heribaldus, wherein are these remarkable Words, Some of late not having a right Opinion concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, have said that this is the Body and Blood of our Lord, which was Born of the Virgin Mary, and in which our Lord suffered on the Cross, and rose from the Dead, which Error we have opposed with all our might. For tho' he name not Paschasius, he states the Error in his Words, which makes it plain he

writ

Fr. Turrian.
contra Volan-
num. de Eu-
char. l. 1.
c. 22.

Du Pin vol. 33
cent. 9. p. 69.

Erasm. in 1.
ep. ad Cor:
c. 7. citante
etiam Salme-
rone tom. 9.
tract. 16. p.
108.

writ against him, and charges him with a new and false Opinion in that Matter, which was far from being the received Doctrin of that Age. Nay, *Paschasius* in his Epistle to *Frudigardus* confesses, That many were then doubtful of his Doctrin. And here-upon it was that *Carolus Calvus*, (and not *Carolus Magnus*, as *Bellarmino* and *Possevine* mistake) put on *Bertramnus*, a Learned Monk of *Corbey*, where *Paschasius* was Abbot, to write on that Subject, and to settle Men's Minds in the Truth about it. And his Book is so plain against Transubstantiation, that *Turrianus* the Jesuit hath no other way to shift it off, but by saying, To cite *Bertram* what is it, but to say the Heresie of Calvin is not new? This *Bertram* writ by Order of *Carolus Calvus*, who was not Emperor till about the Year 876, nor King of France till A. 840, whence it is undeniable that *Bertram* wrote after *Paschasius*: As *Du Pin* also acknowledges, reckoning him for one of those that writ against *Paschasius*, beginning his Account of that Matter with this Concession, It cannot be denied, that there were great Contests in this Age about the Eucharist, occasioned by this Book of *Paschasius*. And Father *Mabillon* (as *Du Pin* tells us) observes that *Paschasius* composed that Book for the Instruction of the Saxons, who were not yet well instructed in the Christian Faith. A plain Intimation that this Doctrin of a carnal Presence was strange, and unheard of in those Parts of the World, tho' Christianity had been long among them.

§. 15. Perhaps I have been too free in allowing *Paschasius* on *Bellarmino's* bold Claim to teach Transubstantiation, which was not licked into that Form, wherein it now stands a Doctrin of the Church of Rome, till long after. For tho' he innovated in some Expressions, yet we find many Passages in him no way consistent with the present Sentiments of the Roman Church, as I am ready to prove, if there be occasion.

§. 16. And now I come to the Eleventh Age, wherein *T. B.* begins his Prescription; and it puts me in mind of *Erasmus's* Observation, one that lived and died in the Romish Communion, and was as well read in the Monuments of Antiquity as any one. That it was late before the Church defined Transubstantiation, unknown to the Ancients both Name and Thing. For this Great Man's Authority is sufficient to destroy the pretended Prescription. If Transubstantiation both Name and Thing were unknown to the Ancients, the running down of poor *Berengarius* in the Eleventh Age will prove a very poor Plea for it. However since so great a Stress is laid on it, I will consider the Matter more distinctly.

§. 17. 1. In the Tenth and Eleventh Century, while the Enemy sowed Tares, the generality were asleep. It was a time of most profound Ignorance. *An unhappy Age*, *Genebrard* calls it, Genebr. Chron. l. 4. *Exhausted of Men famous for Wit and Learning, and of worthy Princes and Bishops.* And *Bellarmino* says, *There was never Age more unlearned and unhappy.* Now as Ignorance inclines to Superstition, so Superstition is forward to entertain any thing, that is recommended for Mystery, and Ineffable. Bell. de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 12.

§. 18. 2. We have no very good Character of the Synods and Councils convened against *Berengarius*.

The first at *Vercelli* in *Italy*, convened by *Leo IX.* at the Instigation of Cardinal *Humbert* and *Hildebrand*, condemn'd him unheard. A. D. 1050.

The next was at *Tours* by *Hildebrand*, Legate of *Victor*, and there *Berengarius* appeared, and declaring that he did not believe Bread and Wine to be empty Figures (as he had been Misrepresented to Teach) and confirming that Declaration by Subscription (as any Protestant will readily do) he was dismissed. For he recanted nothing here, but declared that his was the common and received Opinion of the Church. A. D. 1055.

§. 19. After this, Pope *Nicolas* gathers a Synod at *Rome* of A. D. 1058. 113 Bishops, and before them *Berengarius* appears and defends his Cause so well, that none could stand before him (as *Sigonius* and *Leo Ostiensis* relate the Matter) so that the wise Council was forced to send for *Alberic*, a Monk, after made Cardinal; who also being unable to Dispute with him, writ in seven Days some Arguments against him, and then without daring to Dispute farther, he was commanded to recant in a Form prescribed by Cardinal *Humbert*: Importing that he believed as to the Eucharist that Faith, which Pope *Nicolas* and that Synod delivered, viz. *That the Bread and Wine, which are set on the Altar, after Consecration are not only the Sacrament, Symbole or Figure, but also the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and * are sensibly not only in the Sacrament, but in Truth handled and broken by the Hands of the Priest, and Ground, or bruised by the Teeth of the Faithful.* This he refused at first, but thro' Fears of Imprisonment and Death, at length submitted to. *Lanfranc* indeed relates the Matter otherwise, as if *Berengarius* without saying any thing for himself, had desired a Form of Recantation from the Pope. And by this we see how to Credit him in other Matters relating to this Story, tho' *T. B.* seems to lay great Stress on his Authority. Sigon. de reg. Ital. l. 9. A. 1059. Leo Ostiens. in Chron. Cassinens. l. 3. c. 33. Baron. ad A. 1059. §. 18. * Et sensu aliter, non solum in Sacramento, sed veritate manibus tractari, frangi, & fidelium dentibus asseri.

§. 20. After this, *Berengarius* is called a third Time to *Rome*, A. D. 1078. to a Synod held by *Gregory VII.* (before called *Hildebrand*) and

D

there

† Printed there again forced to Recant. Tho' by the very † *Acts of the* with Lan- Synod it appears, That many Bishops in that Council were of franc Edit. his Mind. Nay, there are good Authors say, That *Hildebrand* Lovan. 1551. himself was doubtful in this Point, tho' his Judgment is not fol. 92, 93. much to be valued, who in a Rage prophantly threw the Sacra- *Omnibus in Ec-* mental Elements into the Fire, and abused them to Magical Pur- *clesia Salvatoris* poses, being himself no better than a Necromancer, as your *Congregatis,* own Authors relate. In *such an Age*, and by *such a Man* in that *habitus est Ser-* Age was the Doctrin of a carnal Presence established against *mo de corpore &* *sanguine Do-* *mini, multis* *hæc, nonnulli* *illa sentienti-* *bus, &c.* *Berengarius.* And,

S. 21. 3.

Lastly, I have something to Remark *about him*. That he was no such contemptible Fellow as some of his Adversaries represent him. *Platina*, and others give him a very laudable Character both for his Sanctity and Learning. And *William of Malmesbury* relates a very high Encomium of him in an Epitaph made by *Hildebertus Canomenensis*, a Learned Bishop his Contemporary. It consists of eighteen Disticks, whereof I will Transcribe only the first and the last.

Quem modo miratur, semper mirabitur Orbis,
Ille Berengarius non obiturnus Obir.
Post obitum secum vivam precor ac requiescam,
Nec fiat melior sors mea sorte sua.

This shews that the Man had not lost all his Friends through his own Inconstancy, and his Enemies Malice. And whereas it is insinuated by *T. B.* as if he had no Followers, the same *W. of* *G. Malmesb.* *Malmesbury*, an Enemy to his Doctrin, says, Tho' he corrected his Opinion, he could not Convert all, whom in the whole *is gestis Re-* *gum Angl. l. 3.* World he had perverted. And a Council at *Placentia*, under *Urban II.* hath a Canon against the Heresie of *Berengarius*, which *S. 15. 20, 21.* shews that his Followers continued to be considerable, notwithstanding his Recantation. Nay, tho' for fear he * recanted, he did not change his Opinion, but died in it, as *Bartoldus Constantiensis* cited by Archbishop *Usher*, out of *Baronius* affirms.

S. 22. After *Berengarius*, I find St. *Bernard* of his Mind in this Matter, affirming, (a) That *Christ's Body in the Sacrament is* *Mania Corpus* *Christi in my-* *sterio sibus* *mentis, non* Food of the Mind, not of the Belly, and therefore not corporally eaten. *veneris, proinde* *corporaliter non* *manducatur.* And in other Places, which to avoid Tedioufness, I forbear to Transcribe, he explains the Doctrin exactly according to the Sentiments of Protestants.

S. 23. After him, (b) *Rupertus Abbas Tuitiensis*, A. 1125, and *Ortho Frisingensis*, Nephew (c) to *Henry IV.* Emperor by his Sister, a Bishop famous for Piety and Learning, A. 1145, taught and writ, that the Bread and Wine remain in the Eucharist after Consecration, and are not converted. And

(a) *Bern. Sermon*
de purificat. B.
Mania Corpus
Christi in my-
sterio sibus
mentis, non
veneris, proinde
corporaliter non
manducatur.
(b) *Rupertus in*
Exod. l. 2. c.
10.
(c) *Christoph.*
Agricol. in
Antipistor. f.
13.

And here it may be proper to observe, That the Word *Transubstantiation* was never heard of, till the 12th Century; first in *Peter Blefenfis*, A. 1140, or *Stephanus Eduensis*, whom tho' *Bellarmino* places at the end of the Tenth Century, others judge to have flourished in this.

§. 24. And now have I brought the History to the Thirteenth A. D. 1215. Century, and the famous *Lateran Council* under *Innocent III.* which first established this Doctrin under the Name of *Transubstantiation*. And of this Council I have these Things to Note.

1. That this was the first Council that established *Transubstantiation* into an Article of Faith in the Church of *Rome*. This is acknowledged by some Learned *Romanists*. *Scotus* grants that this Doctrin was not thought always necessary to be believed, and that the necessity of believing it was consequent upon the Declaration of this Council. *Durandus* freely discovers his Inclination to believe the contrary, if this Determination of the Matter had not obliged him to believe it. And *Tonstall*, Bishop of *Durham*, grants that before this Council Men were at their Liberty as to the manner of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament. And if it was here that *Transubstantiation* began to be an Article of Faith, I may conclude it but a Novelty, and their first Possession begins where they begin to plead Prescription.

§. 25. 2. The Decrees of this Council were never published, never quoted nor took notice of for above Three Hundred Years after it was held: Till *John Coebleus*, one of *Luther's* Adversaries produced them after their long Concealment, about Twenty Years after *Luther* had begun the Reformation: Pretending to have found an obscure Manuscript of them, which he sends to *Peter Crabbe* to be annexed to his Councils. And it is certain they are not in *Merlin's* Edition of the Councils, tho' those of *Constance* and *Basil* are, which were celebrated long after this.

3. There were no Subscriptions of any Bishops to this Council, and *Matt. Paris* tells us, That Sixty Capitula were proposed in it, which some liked, and others thought burdensome; and that they all ended in Laughter and Mockery. *Godfridus* also, and *Platina* both affirm the same Thing, that nothing was decreed in this Council.

§. 26. 4. But *Coffreus*, to strengthen the Authority of *Cobleus's* blind Manuscript produces a *Greek* Translation, and says it was as ancient as the Council its self. And in this the whole first Chapter about *Transubstantiation* is wanting; so that if that Translation prove any thing, the least is, that the *Greek* Church

in that Age did not Concur with the *Latines* in that Article, but that all the East, and four Patriarchs of five rejected it. And it is a little unlucky that in this first Council that is pretended to establish Transubstantiation, that very Chapter that concerns it should be so carelessly dropt by the *Greek Church*. A sure Sign they were not very fond of it.

*Du Pin Dis-
sertat. p. 573.*

§. *Du Pin*, a Dr. of the *Sorbon*, and with the Approbation of the Faculty, determines, That no Canons were made by this Council, but that some Decrees being framed by that Pope alone, and read in the Council, some of them to the Major Part seemed burdensome.

§. 27. 6. *Henry*, Brother to *Baldwin*, E. of *Flanders*, being then possessed of *Constantinople*, with the Title of *Greek Emperor*, the four *Greek Patriarchs* were all *Western Bishops*, one a *French-Man*, and the other three *Italians*, who held their Patriarchates of the Pope, and were never owned in their respective Titular Sees: So that all *T. B's* Noise of the Consent of the *Eastern and Western Church* to this Article in this Council comes at last to just nothing.

A. D. 1438.

§. 28. But what can be said to the famous Council of *Florence*? I Answer,

1. That it was later by Two Hundred Years than the *Lateran*, and by so much less able to prove the Antiquity of this Doctrin.

2. That the *Greek Bishops*, who were there, by good Management were drawn to Subscribe more than ever they designed, more than that Church would afterwards own, or any one *Greek Bishop*, except those few Bishops that were present at it.

3. It contradicts the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, in the Point of the Pope's Supremacy; and it was one main Business and Design of it so to do. And what Authority is there in Councils contradicting one another?

4. Ask the *French* why it is not received in the *Gallican Church*, and their Answer will vindicate us; who think our selves as much obliged to contend for the Christian Faith, as they for Liberty and Privileges.

As for the Council of *Trent*, so many Volumes have been written to prove its Nullity, that I need to say no more of it, than that it deserves no more regard than those of *Lateran* and *Florence*.

§. 30. *T. B.* names Two Synods of the *Oriental Church* in the Seventeenth Century, one by *Cyrill ab Iberia* (so *T. B.* reads it) tho' I read it being a little blindly writ at *Iberia*, and charged it

it for a Mistake; and as it is read by him, it cannot be justified, since that *Cyrrill* is in all Authors, I find him stiled *Berrhaensis*, not *Iberus*, and consequently not *ab Iberia*, but of *Berrhae*, in the Year 1639, and another under *Parthenius* his Successor, A. D. 1642. Both these we allow him to make his best of, since we have the Authority of the ancient *Greek Church* on our side, which much outweighs that of their poor, ignorant and mercenary Posterity: Whose Clergy (as *Sr. Paul Ricaut* tells us in his Preface to his *Present State of the Greek Church*) are not so knowing as most of our ordinary *Mechanicks*: And those few that have any Learning, have usually their Education in *Italy*, and being there leavened with *Popish Errors*, help to manage their more ignorant Brethren for the Interest of the *Roman Church*.

§. 31. And now I come to the second part of my present Undertaking.

(2.) To consider *T. B's* Arguments for *Transubstantiation* distinctly, and apply what I have proved in the foregoing Historical Account to every Particular. His main Assertion is this, *That the Church of Rome hath this Doctrin of Transubstantiation by an assured Continuance from the Apostles, and that consequently it is one of those Doctrins that was confirmed by the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles.* To prove this

§. 32. (1.) His first Argument is from the unanimous Agreement of the visible Church, in opposing the first Broacher of the contrary Doctrin, which he supposes to have been *Berengarius*. In Answer to which

1. I have shewed that *Berengarius* was not the first that opposed a substantial Change in the Elements of the Eucharist. Witness what hath been cited about *Mark* the Arch-Heretick in *Irenaus*, and the several Fathers opposing the *Eutychians*, and other Hereticks in the Fifth Age, and all that writ against *Paschasius* in the Ninth.

§. 33. 2. Supposing that the prevailing part of the visible Church in the Tenth and Eleventh Century was for a substantial Change, will it thence follow, that it was alway the Doctrin of the Christian Church? Was there not a time, when the prevailing part of the visible Church was for *Arianism*, and in the Council of *Sirmium*, confirmed and defended by Pope *Liberius*, decreed in favour of the *Arians* or *Semi-Arians*? And must I thence conclude, that was the Doctrin of the Christian Church by assured Continuance? Then was *Athanasius* in the same Case as *Berengarius* in the Eleventh Century, and this Argument is as strong to prove the first an Heretick, as the latter. And if *Athanasius* held an Apostolical Verity, tho' all the World was against him,
Berenga-

Berengarius's Opinion is not proved a Novelty by the opposition of the prevailing part of the visible Church against him: Especially if it be considered how much more Learned *Athanasius's* Age was than *Berengarius's*. And if one *Athanasius* was of more Authority than a prevailing Multitude of learned, but prejudiced Bishops with a Pope to back them; one *Berengarius*, a learned and pious Man, ought to be of more value than whole Councils of ambitious, unlearned and ignorant Prelates.

T. B. § 5.

*Ush. Answ. to
Jesuites Chall.
p. 77. & 80.*

T. B. § 6.

§. 34. But five Learned Men (says T. B.) who writ against *Berengarius*, charge him with opposing herein the Sentiments and Belief of the whole Christian World. And is the Testimony of Adversaries warmed in Controversie such unexceptionable Evidence? Had not *Berengarius's* Writings been all carefully suppressed, we might have produced his Testimonies against his Adversaries, and the Lie given to their bold Brags. For I have already shewed, that he had many Followers both alive, and after his Death: And had *Landfranc* been acquainted with this Island, when he writ against *Berengarius*, as well as when he came afterward to be preferred in it, he might have named, not a Village only, but a whole Kingdom, that believed not Transubstantiation, as appears from a Saxon Homily produced by Archbishop *Usher*, and too large to be here transcribed.

§. 35. But now comes the killing Argument with a passionate Appeal to every serious Man's Conscience, Whether the well-meaning Laity (supposed to be many Millions) could prudently and conscientiously refuse to submit their Judgments to all these Councils. What must the poor Laity do (says T. B.) who following the Rules of Modesty and rational Obedience, must unavoidably run into a superstitious Belief, and idolatrous Worship? And how shall we vindicate the sweet Providence of God for bringing them into these Straits? To all this I answer

*Gloss. Decret.
de Consecrat.
dist. 2. in cap.
Ego Berengarius.*

§. 36. 1. In the Council at Rome, under Pope *Nicolas*, 113 Bishops, and a Pope to Head them, decreed according to the Form of *Berengarius's* Recantation, That the Body and Blood of Christ are sensibly, not only in the Sacrament, but in the Truth handled and broken by the Priest, and ground by the Teeth of the Faithful. And what must the poor Laity do, but believe this, and so make parts of Christ's Body? Which the Gloss upon the Canon Law says expressly, is a greater Error than that of *Berengarius*.

§. 37. 2. Apply T. B's Harangue to the Council of *Sirmium*, as general as the *Lateran* for number of Bishops both Eastern and Western, confirmed and defended by Pope *Liberius*: Whose Creed yet is accounted Heretical by the Church of Rome, as well

as by Protestants. What then were the many Millions of Laity to do? Must they presume to be Wiser, than a Council of Learned Bishops and a Pope? Would it be modest for them to pretend to understand Scripture and Fathers better than a Council? If it be said this was no Council but a Conventicle, because (however in other respects general) it approved Heresie; we have as much to say against the great *Lateran* Council, whose *deposing Doctrin* is judged Heretical by many honest Papists. And if a Council in other respects General may be rejected for decreeing Heresie, why may not we? Why might not the Laity in the eleventh and thirteenth Ages, have rejected those Councils that decreed Heresie, as we verily believe?

§. 38. 3. Compare your Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* with that of *Flurence* in the point of the Pope's Supremacy, and tell me what must the poor Laity do, who by *T. B.'s Rules of Modesty and rational Obedience*, are bound to believe Contradictions?

§. 39. 4. What Obligation could there lie on the modest Laity, who lived in the 13th Age, to submit to the *Lateran* Council, whose Decrees were not published till the fifteenth Age? Which was not subscribed by any Bishops, and in which nothing was decreed.

§. 40. 5. What modest Man can pretend the consent of the universal Church in that Council for Transubstantiation, when the *Greek* Church would not own that Council, and the *Greek* Patriarchs were all Nominal and Titular, and only for Ostentation.

§. 41. 6. If these Councils are the supreme Judicature, to be submitted to under pain of being treated as Heathens and Publicans, what becomes of the *Gallican* Church and many learned Papists, who as to the Pope's Supremacy, and the *deposing Power* do not receive them?

§. 42. 7. Tho' *Modesty, Prudence* and *Reason* oblige the Laity in difficult and doubtful Matters, to give great Deference to their spiritual Guides, yet it does not oblige them to put out their own Eyes, and suffer themselves to be led by them against plain Scriptures, Sense and Reason.

§. 43. 8. Lastly, If *Providence* may be vindicated in *Athanasius's* Time, when all the World (as *St. Hierome* says) wondered to see it self *Arian*, we shall not want an Apology for permitting this Heresie of Transubstantiation to prevail in the Eleventh Age.

§. 44. And now from a Divine, *T. B.* turns Lawyer, and charges *T. B.* §. 11. us with his *Olim possideo, prior possideo*. Which puts me in Mind of the wise Solicitor for a City in a Suit at Law, who said he want-

wanted only the proof of one small point in Chronology, and he was sure of his Cause, which was to prove *Henry VII.* lived before *Henry III.* For *T. B's* Prescription cannot be withstood, if he can but prove the eleventh Century before the five First. We had all for us so long, except the *Eutychians*; and we are content to stand to *St. Augustine's* Rule, *Quod Universa tenet Ecclesia*, &c. For the Universal Church held our Doctrine against a carnal Presence in *St. Augustine's* Time; nor was it decreed then by any Council, but was always retained, and therefore was delivered by Christ and his Apostles. And if *St. Augustine's* Rule was for us in his Days, your later Councils cannot have altered the Case. And now I come to

T. B. §. 12.

§. 45. *T. B's* second Argument for the assured continuance of his Doctrine of a substantial Change in the possession of the Church, from Christ and his Apostles, viz. *That no Bishop or Pastor was ever complained of by his Flock, for Teaching contrary to his Predecessor in this point.* In answer to which, it may be considered.

Gal. v. 3.

§. 46. 1. That there have been Innovations in the Church, of which it cannot be told in what Parish or Diocese it began. *Seducers may creep in unawares*, against whom, when the Matter is discovered, we must contend earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints; and not conclude, because we saw not the time when the Seducers first crept in; that therefore they are no Seducers, but Teachers of Apostolical Verities. The Tares may not be discerned till they are grown up; and we must not argue that they are good Wheat, because none observed the very time when they were Sown. By *T. B's* Argument, the Servants in the Parable might have convinced their Master, that there were no Tares in the Field: Because, if an Enemy had come into the Field to Sow them, some Servant or other would have took notice of him, and immediately told their Master, *This Seed, Sir, is not like that we Sowed Yesterday*: But no such thing was done, and therefore no Tares were Sown. Whereas it was no wonder, if what was done in the Night, was not at that time discovered. The tenth and

Baron. Annal. tom. 10. A. 900.

eleventh Ages, for want of Writers, are called as *Baronius* acknowledges, *the obscure Age*. A proper Night for the Sowing of Tares without notice, since that Age took little Notice of Things, and Recorded less. To this add

2 Thess. 2, 7.

2. That there is a vast difference between such Heresies as openly attack the Foundation of our Faith, and a *Mystery of Iniquity*, that under the Cloak of Piety, and a Pretence of greater Reverence to the Institutions of our Religion, insinuates itself.

§. 47.

§. 47. 3. Lastly, the Original of Error oft is so obscure, that however observed in the Age wherein it first began, in tract of time its beginning may be forgotten. We read that the *Sadducees* taught there were no Angels: Must we say this was always the Doctrin of the *Jewish Church*, because no Man can tell under what High Priest this Error was first broached?

The *Grecians, Circassians, Habassines, and Russians* at this Day differ in many things from the Church of *Rome*: Will *T. B.* undertake to tell me in what Bishop's Days all these Differences first rose?

The Church of *Rome* denies the Laity the Cup, but will *T. B.* say they never communicated in the Cup in the primitive Church; because it cannot be declared, in what Parish or Diocese that Innovation began?

§. 48. In like manner Bishop *Fisher* affirms, *It cannot be determined, when Indulgencies first came in*: And yet none will say, they were always in the Church. In my Mind it is very unreasonable to deny, that a thing which hath been done, ever was done, because no Body can tell the very Time and Place, when and where it was first done. Rossens. Assert. Luther. Confut. Art. 18.

§. 49. 3. *T. B.*'s third Argument, is from the Absurdity of a Supposition he charges us with, viz. *If there was a change in the Church from the Non-belief of a substantial Change, to the Belief of it, that Change was either all at once or gradual.* I answer. T. B. §. 13.

§. 50. 1. We allow the first absurd, and the latter is already proved. There were some beginnings of Transubstantiation in *Mark* the Heretick, and the *Eutychians* taught something like it, which the Fathers opposed. On the occasion of Image-Worship, the Language of the Church began to be altered, and a corporeal Change to be favoured by the Patrons of that Idolatry. When *Paschasius* first writ for it, the most Learned Men of that Age opposed him. Even in *Berengarius's* Time, it was long before they could lick the Monster into Shape, making him under Pope *Nicolas* to recant in a form, that afterwards even to themselves seem'd absurd: So that twenty Years after, *Gregory VII.* calls him to recant in another form. And from the Council of *Nice, A. 787.* to that under *Gregory VII. A. 1079.* it was almost three Hundred Years. In all which time this Matter was contested and in hammering, before it could be advanced to what it now is in the *Roman Church, an Article of Faith.*

§. 51. 2. From the time of the second Council of *Nice* to that at *Rome*, was the most favourable Season that ever happened in the Christian Church, for the introducing of such an Opinion: Being a most dismal time for Ignorance, Superstition and Vice.

Vice. And what *Tares* might not the *Enemy* sow in so dark and long a *Night*?

§. 52. 3. It was a far more Learned Age, wherein *Arianism* was started; and for that Reason the Truth met with more able Defenders, and a greater stir was raised against the Opposers of it: Which tho' *T. B.* magnifies, yet considering the Ignorance and Superstition of the Age wherein his Doctrin was broached, the Opposition then made against it (as I have shewed) was considerable. For Ignorance made the People secure and careless, as Superstition disposed them to receive any thing that came to them under the pretence of Mystery, and greater Reverence and Devotion for the Sacrament. Yet notwithstanding this secure and passive Temper of the People, Men eminent for Piety and Learning opposed it, as *Rabanus*, *Herebaldus*, *Scotus* and *Ratramnus*. And since *T. B.* will needs have some Stir and Bustle about it, the last in his Preface says, *That they who according to their several Opinions, talked differently about the Mystery of Christ's Body and Blood, were divided by no small Schism.*

§. 53. 4. Suppose Transubstantiation had come in silently, that we could have found no Records of the Occasion, nor of any Opposition against it; yet when we have proved (as in my Arguments from Antiquity appears) that for the first Five Hundred Years it was no Doctrin of the Christian Church: Is it not very extravagant to pretend a demonstration against Matter of Fact? To attempt to prove that impossible to have been, which most certainly was? What is this but with *Zeno*, to prove there could be no motion, against *Diogenes* walking before his Eyes, and thereby at once disturbing and confuting his Lecture? And now I am come

T. B. §. 16.

§. 54. 4. To *T. B.*'s fourth Argument from Scripture. His Preface hath some things very exceptionable, as it supposes the *Roman* to be the Universal Church, which we think to be but a corrupt part of it; and that the Scriptures receive their Authority from the Church, which would run him into the Circle he cautions us to avoid. But I think it reasonable not to engage in another Controversie till the present be at an end: And shall therefore only say, that thus far we are agreed, that we take the Scriptures for the Word of God on the Testimony of the Universal Church, and will submit to any Interpretations of the Scriptures made by the Universal Church: By which Concessions his Cause will get nothing. I proceed now

Matt. 16. 18.
and 28. 20.

§. 55. 1. To his first Set of Texts from the Scriptures, viz. Christ's Promise that the *Gates of Hell* should not prevail against it: That he would be with his Disciples to the end of the World: And that

the

the Holy Ghost should teach them all Truth. For, as he argues, if *fo. 14. 18.*
 Transubstantiation be false, *the Gates of Hell prevailed against the* T. B. §. 20.
Church in the time of *Berengarius*, and when so many Councils
 determined for it, in which the Church, if ever, was represent-
 ed. In Answer to this I observe

§. 56. 1. That *T. B.* brings us here to a new Controversy
 whether the Church be infallible. For if those Texts were in-
 tended to assure the Church of Infallibility, and the *Roman* be
 the Universal Church (both which will bear a Debate, and he
 knows we deny) then hath he gained his Point. And for my
 part, I know no Method more proper to perswade Men to be-
 lieve Transubstantiation, than to perswade them, if they can,
 that their Church cannot be mistaken: And whoever can so far,
 mortifie his Reason and Senses, as to believe her here in the right,
 cannot reasonably boggle at her Infallibility in any other Point.
 But

§. 57. 2. *The Gates of Hell* may prevail over a particular Church
 without violation of Christ's Promise, and the *Roman Church* is
 no more. And how well the Universal Church was represented
 by the Councils in *Berengarius's* time and others that followed
 them, I have shewed above. And if Christ's Promise was not
 broken at the prevailing of *Arianism*, it was not now violated by
 the prevalence of Transubstantiation.

§. 58. 3. The true import of that Promise is, That Christ's
 Church shall never fail, that he will always have a pure Church
 in the World, tho' he suppose that sometimes it may be but a
little Flock. The Church is in the Psalmist's style, *established as Ps. 89. 37.*
the Moon, which sometimes increases, sometime decreases, and
 sometime for a while may disappear; and yet will recover its
 pristine Splendor and last to the end of the World.

§. 59. 4. When Christ says to his Disciples, *Lo, I am with you*
always to the end of the World: He promises his Grace to every
 particular Christian, and not only to the Church Representative.
 And if a particular Christian grieve the Holy Spirit, and drive
 him from him; Christ hath not broke his Promise, tho' he thro'
 his own Fault lose the Benefit of it. And if a number of Bishops
 met together, are managed by the Methods of worldly Policy
 and Tricks, used to prevent a free Debate, and to gain a Majority
 to that side where the Pope's Interest is concerned; 'tis their
 Fault if the Holy Ghost forsake them, that would fetch him from
Rome in a Portmantwa, leaving them to establish Errors and be-
 lieve a Lie. This appears to be no impossible Supposition in the
 Case of the Council of *Sirmium*, and we can see no Reason to
 think better of the *Lateran*, *Florence* and *Trent.* I may add

Matt. 16. 12,
13.

§. 60. 5. That the Promise of teaching the Disciples all Truth, is a Promise peculiar to the Apostles, to whom Christ says, *I have many Things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth.* It is hence manifest, that there were some Truths the Apostles, in Christ's Life-time, were not able to bear, and that after the descent of the Holy Ghost, they should be instructed in. Such were the Doctrin that Christ's Kingdom was not temporal; the abrogation of the Jewish Dispensation; and that the Salvation of the *Messias* belonged to the *Gentiles* as well as the *Jews*. Now after the Holy Ghost had discover'd to the Apostles these Truths, which they could not bear in Christ's Life-time, they were then led into all Truth, and this Promise fulfilled: Which was never intended for an assurance, that the major part of the Church should never in after Ages fall into Errour.

Pf. 16. 3, 5.
T. B. §. 21.

§. 61. 2. T. B's 2d. Set of Texts from Scripture, are such as foretel the Conversion of Nations and Kingdoms to the Christian-Faith: Which *Honour*, says he, is peculiar to the Church of Rome, and her Adversaries can lay no claim to it. All the Conversions made in the last five Centuries, have been made by her, made to the Belief of the substantial Presence in the Eucharist, and all confirmed by Miracles; particularly that by *Xaverius* in the Indies, as also *Augustine* the Monk in England, and *St. Bernard* at *Tholouse*: Which two latter he mentioned before, and I have reserved for this place, to consider them altogether. To all which I Answer

1. As there were very famous Prophecies in the Old Testament, concerning the Conversions of the *Gentiles*; so they all received a remarkable Completion in the first Ages of Christianity. Those Conversions were carried on by Miracles, and of them it is that *St. Augustine* hath that remarkable Thought, which T. B. deservedly admires. Now the Honour of these first Conversions, we Protestants, who believe all Apostolical Doctrins, share in with all the rest of the Catholick Church.

§. 62. 2. What are the latter Conversions which the Church of Rome boasts of? Where lye the Nations, which in the last Five Hundred Years, she hath made Christians? The poor *Indians* in *America* were rather Massacred than Converted by the *Spaniards*, as a Popish Bishop hath related the Matter. *Japan* is now all Heathen, and the late *China* Converts are as very Heathen Idolaters as ever they were, and the *Jesuits* are put to all their Shifts to ward off a Condemnation even at Rome, for their good Services in Perverting the Christian Religion there.

§. 63. 3. It was no Character of Orthodoxy, which our Saviour gives the *Pharisees*, that they compassed Sea and Land to make *Profelytes*, and took more Pains to Pervert, than others did to Convert Men.

§. 64. 4. The *Goths* and *Vandals* were Converted to Christianity by *Arian* Bishops, sent by the Emperor *Valens*. (a) And sure (a) *fo. Magni Archiepisc. Upsalensis. Hist. Goth. & Suev. l. 15. c. 1. p. 476. and c. 2. Hist. Goth. Vand. & Longobard. ab H. Grotio partim versa partim in ordine digesta. Amstel. 1655. Prolegom. p. 30. Formandes de rebus Goth. c. 25. p. 646. Et Isidori Chron. p. 710.* To which add, That *Mahometanism* hath made large Conversions, which yet are no evidence of its Truth. And as far as we know of *Romish Conversions* in these latter Ages, they have been carried on by *Mahometan Methods*. They talk indeed of Conversions by Miracles, but they still take care to lay the Scene far enough off. And what they have done one nearer home hath been by *Faggots* and *Dragoons*. If there be indeed a power of Miracles in the Church of *Rome*, why was it not display'd in the late Conversion of *France*? Why have none of you so much Love for your Country-Men here in *England*, as to display this *Glory of Miracles* among them for their Conversion? Methinks it is very unkind to send all your Wonder-working-Missionaries into the *Indies*, and none into any Protestant Countries. This we think a good Reason to be cautious how we credit your Boasts of Miracles in the *Indies*.

§. 65. 5. There is far less Reason to credit Popish Miracles, than Christ's and his Disciples. For these were performed in the Face of their Enemies, and published with Circumstances so particular and notorious, that nothing had been more easie, than to have confuted the History of them in the *Gospels* and the *Acts*, if they had not been true. Whereas Popish Miracles are all done (if done at all) either in Countries where they are all of a side, or at so great a distance, that the Reports which we have only from themselves, cannot be examined. *T. B.* indeed tells us of two Protestant Writers that bear witness to *Xaverius's* Miracles, and when he directs us where to find them, I will consider their Testimony and give them all the credit they can deserve. In the mean time I am perswaded that *Xaverius* wrought no Miracles. For *Varenius* informs us, That *Turselinus* mentions two Miracles of his, the raising of a dead Girl, and curing a Leper; but adds, *sed credat qui potest*. And he further affirms, That *Xaverius* nowhere in his Epistles, says a word of any Miracles, but complains of their want of the *Japonesse* Language (the most necessary Miracle of any for the Conversion of the Nations) as a great obstruction to their Proceedings. He adds, That *Maffaus* in his History, says not a word of *Xaverius's* Miracles. I find also that *Acosta*, an Eye-witness of what was done in the other *Indies*,

Indies, affirms, There were no Miracles wrought there; and at large debates the Case, why God gave not the Power of Miracles to them that now Preach to Infidels as he did of Old; and shews, that there is not so much need of it now that the Christian Religion hath been confirmed by Miracles, as at first there was. I know since *Xaverius's* Death, his Miracles have been boasted of, and *Melchior Numezius*, says, *Many Miracles were discovered since his Death*. And is not this a very probable Circumstance to convince us? Would the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles have Converted Infidels, if nothing had been known of them while they were living? It may not be improper to give one Instance how ready the *Jesuits* are to forge Miracles after the Saint's Death, that were not known in his Life: It is in their Founder *Loyola*. For when *Rabadineira*, who was his familiar Companion, first published his Life, *A. 1572*. he made a long Apology for *Ignatius*, that he had wrought no Miracles: But in a second Edition, *A. 1610*. he gives us a long Catalogue of his Miracles. Now can it be imagined, that the Miracles of *Ignatius*, who dyed, *A. 1556*. should be unknown for the first sixteen Years after his Death, when if any had been wrought, the memory of them would have been the freshest, and yet after Fifty four Years, when many of the Witnesses must be supposed to be Dead, should be advanced to undoubted certainty? I am perswaded it was such another discovery the *Portugal* Ambassador made of *Xaverius's* Miracles long after his Death, who himself knew nothing of any such Matters. *T. B.* will do well to compare the Time when *Xaverius* dyed, with the Time when the Ambassador attested the Affidavits, that we may know how long it was after his Death, that the Discoveries *Numezius* mentions were made.

§. 66. 6. If we had never so much reason to believe, That Popish Missionaries had done some wonderful Things, not easily distinguishable from divine Miracles by the nature of the Works themselves, yet we have good reason to reject them as no Seals of divine Truth. For whereas the Miracles of Christ and his Disciples, were exact Impletions of former Predictions concerning himself, and the believing Jews had this reason to take those Miracles for a Divine Testimony; that they had been told before-hand, That Christ, the great Prophet, when he came, should perform just such Miracles as Jesus did: We have the very same reason not to credit Popish Wonders, because it hath been foretold, that

2 Thess. 2. 9. False Prophets should come with Signs and lying Wonders, and all Deceivableness of Unrighteousness; and that too, to countenance an

1 Tim. 4. 1. Apostacy, or falling away from the Truth. So that after Christ and

and his Apostles had fixed the Rule of Faith to last for ever, we are cautioned that *tho' an Angel from Heaven should reach any other Doctrin* than that, which was Preached at first, *he should be accursed.* Suppose then that *Xaverius* had wrought those Wonders in *England*, which we are told he did somewhere in the *Indies*; being they were to countenance Doctrins not delivered by Christ or his Apostles at first, we ought to have rejected his Miracles for the same Reason we are to acknowledge and submit to the Evidence of Christ's. For *Xaverius's* Miracles are an Impletion of the Prophecies of the latter Apostacy, as Christ's were of the Prophecies concerning the Messiah, a Preacher of Divine Truths. And since no new Doctrin ought to be Preached to the end of the World, and it hath been foretold that *False-Teachers* should come with Signs and Wonders, it is reasonable to conclude that Miracles are now to be examined by Doctrins, and not Doctrins by Miracles; and that we are to be more careful in examining their Doctrins that pretend to Miracles, than if they made no such Pretences; Yea, and notwithstanding their Glory of Miracles, to reject them, if they be plainly contrary to Scripture, Reason and Sense. So that your late Conversions by pretended Miracles, prove not your new Doctrins to be true; but your new Doctrins prove your Miracles to be only lying Wonders, and your Conversions in Truth Perversions of the Nations, in the Honour and Recompence of which we desire not to share. I might to this add a Passage I find cited out of *Bellarmino*, concerning a Miracle wrought by *Paulus Novatianus*, that it confirmed not his Heresie, but the Catholick Truths which he retained together with it. For by Parity of Reason the Miracles of a Missionary may confirm the fundamental Truths of Christianity, and not the Superstructures of *Hay and Stubble* he adds to them.

§. 67. Before I leave this Subject of Conversions and Miracles, I must take notice of what T. B. in the beginning of his Paper T. B. §. 3. says about *Augustine* the Monk, and *St. Bernard*. Concerning the former I have read *Bede*, and find he Reports that he cured a Blind Man, to convince the *British Bishops*, that they ought to submit to him as their *Metropolitan*, and comply with the Customs of the Church of *Rome* in the time of keeping Easter, and in the manner of shaving their Monks. Now I think this *non dignus vindice nodus*, too trivial a Matter to appeal to Heaven for a Miracle about. I find *Augustine* also to have been both in respect of his Pride and Cruelty too ill a Man to be so far favoured by God, so that we may well suspect *Bede's* Relation, writ not at the time of doing this Fact, but above an Hundred Years after, by a Man strongly addicted to the See of *Rome*, and in an Age.

Melch. Canus
loc. Theo. 1. 11.
c. 6. Bede in
Historia An-
glorum labitur
interdum, vul-
goque jactata
miracula scri-
bit.

Suarez tom. 4.
in 3. Thom.
disput. 46. §.
12, 13. Nihilominus aliqua
proponam, propter
ter que mihi
suspecta esse vi-
dentur.

Age, when they began to ascribe Miracles to those that never wrought any. To which add what some of your own Authors say to invalidate *Bede's* Authority in this Matter. *Melchior Canus* says, *Bede in his History of the English makes a slip sometimes, and writes Miracles upon common Report.* And *Suarez* says of a Story taken out of him, That it seems fit to be suspected by him, and offers his Reasons for his Suspicion.

And now to confirm what I have said above, That the Church of *England* was at this time a stranger to Transubstantiation, and consequently that *Augustine's* Miracles could not confirm that Doctrin, it may not be improper to observe, That *Bede* was no Friend to that Doctrin, as is evident from several Passages in his Writings, which I have ready to produce. And I desire *T. B.* to let me know, what he thinks of the Custom of burning the remainder of the consecrated Elements after the Communion: Which was ordered by two several Canons in *England*, one the 13th of those in *Spelman*, that go under the Title of *Bede's A. D. 700*, and the other the 38th under King *Edgar A. D. 970*. Could they believe the Elements to be *Christ's* natural Body and Blood, and yet treat them so scurvily? Would not burning *Christ's* natural Body have been as abominable a Crime, as that of the *Jews* who crucified him? So that the Church of *England*, when those Canons were made was a stranger to Transubstantiation.

§. 68. As to *Godefridus* Relation of *St. Bernard's* Miracles, we may well suspect them, since *St. Bernard* himself Apologizes for the want of Miracles in his Days, and says the greatest Miracles he wrought was in the great Works done in the Hearts of Believers, whereof he and others were the Blessed Instruments: So that it is a common thing for Writers of Lives in the Church of *Rome*, to coin Miracles for the credit of the Saint, whom they intend to Magnifie. To which add that *St. Bernard's* Writings shew he was not for Transubstantiation, and consequently that his Miracles, if he did any, could not confirm that Doctrin. To conclude, I have these Things to add about Miracles, that when ever *T. B.* desires it, I undertake

1. To prove out of the Fathers and Popish Authors, that Miracles were of Use only for the first confirmation of Christianity, and since that are ceased as no further useful.

2. That *Arians*, and other Hereticks pretended to Miracles as well as *Papists*.

3. That a Pretence to Miracles is a surer Sign of *Herésie* now, than of *Orthodoxy*, even from the Testimony of Fathers.

T. B. §. 23.

§. 69. And now at length *T. B.* comes to the Words of Institution, where in Reason he ought to have begun, and by them

them he is content to be tried, if we will take them in that Sense, his Church and Councils (which what ones they were, hath been above shewed) have interpreted them. Or since he foresees we shall be a little Refractory to that Proposal, he thinks it reasonable, and we acquiesce with him in it, that they be taken in the most obvious and literal Sense, since *Christ spake them, as a Testator, a Teacher, and a Friend to his Disciples.* This is what I contend for in my second Argument against Transubstantiation. And I add to what is there said, that to take them in the Sense of Transubstantiation, is neither good Sense, nor good Grammar, *Hoc panis est Corpus*, agrees not with the Rules of Grammar. *Hoc Corpus est Corpus* is a Tautology. But refer *Hoc* (as we do) to the whole Sentence foregoing, *this Taking, Blessing, Breaking and Eating is my Body*, or the Sacrament wherein *my Body is verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful*, and it is good Grammar, and good Sense too, and the most obvious and literal Sense of the Words.

§. 70. T. B's last Pretence from Scripture for Transubstantia- T. B. §. 23.
tion is from the Conformity of it to God's Design, who in the Legal Sacrifices made *the People to Eat of the Sacrifice*, that they might partake of the Benefit of it, and *that therefore the same ought to be done in the New Law, that the Figure might be fulfilled.* For which he cites, 1 Cor. 10. 16, 18. and I see he is resolved to oblige me in the Close by this very civil Argument, in which I can see nothing either for his, or against our Opinion in the Doctrin under Debate. For

§. 71. 1. The Apostle affirms it, and we grant it, That the *Israelites, who did Eat of the Sacrifice were Partakers of the Altar.* And

2. We Teach and Believe, That the worthy Receiver receives not the bare Elements, but the Body and Blood of Christ, *which are verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper.*

3. The Cup may be the *Communication of Christ's Blood*, and the Bread the *Communication of his Body* without Transubstantiation. For the benefit of a Sacrament depends upon the Blessing annexed to the Institution. And as *Water in Baptism* without any substantial change made in that Element, may by the Divine Blessing, accompanying the Institution, be effectual to the washing away of Sin; so *Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper* may by the same Divine Blessing on the Institution make the worthy Receiver to partake of the Benefits without any substantial Change in those Elements. Especially since Christ himself hath said, *Verily the Flesh profiteth nothing.*

F

§. 73. And

§. 73. And now I have gone through T. B's Paper, and answered (as I am persuaded) very clearly every Thing in it, that looks like an Argument. And upon the whole I find, I have some Reason to give him Thanks for such Reasons for Transubstantiation, as have been so far from shaking my Faith, that they have hugely confirmed it, and made me more Confident Transubstantiation is false, since such a Select Champion can produce no better Supports for it.

T. B. §. 24. §. 74. I have expected T. B's Testimonies from the Fathers to prove his Prescription, which he promised to send me above a Week since, but I find he is no Slave to his Word. I desire him in the mean time to take Notice, that it will not serve his Turn to produce their Testimonies for a *great and real Change* made in the Elements by Consecration. For we acknowledge as great a Change in them, as in an *Altar* after its Consecration, in a *Priest* after his Ordination (by which some of the Fathers represent this Matter) or in a *Parchment* after the *Deed* is sealed and executed, tho' there is no Transubstantiation in any of these Changes. He must therefore produce such Testimonies as declare, that the Substance of Bread and Wine cease to be in the Elements, and their Accidents left destitute of a Subject, or to inhere in that Body and Blood of Christ, which was Conceived and Born of the Virgin *Mary*, or they will not reach to prove his Point. And I am persuaded it is as possible to do that, as to prove Transubstantiation consistent with Sense, Reason and Scripture.

THE

THE
TESTIMONY
OF THE
FATHERS
FOR THE
Real and Substantial PRESENCE
OF
Our Saviour's Body and Blood in the
Blessed Eucharist.

(1.) **T**O begin with St. Ignatius, a Father of the first Age, a Contemporary and Disciple of the Apostles. In his Epistle to the Citizens of Smyrna, he has these *Ep. ad Smyrn.* Words concerning certain Hereticks of his Time. *They admit no Eucharists or Oblations, because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our Sins.*

(2.) St. Justin, a Father of the second Age, speaking of the Blessed Eucharist Administred to the People has these Words. *We do not take these Things as common Meat, or common Drink: But as Jesus Christ our Saviour being incarnated by the Word of God, had Flesh and Blood for our Salvation; so we are taught (by the Apostles as follows) that in the same manner that the Food from which our Flesh and Blood by Change are nourished, by the Prayers and Be-*
nediction

meditation of the same Word pass'd upon it, is the Flesh of the same Incarnate Jesus. Therefore since Jesus by the Word of God was made Flesh, not figuratively but truly, and substantially, Bread and Wine by the same Word of God, are made not figuratively, but truly and substantially his Body and Blood, St. Justin affirming it to be done by the same Word, in the same manner.

De Can.

(3.) St. Cyprian, a Father of the third Age, has these Words. *The Bread, which our Lord gave to his Disciples, not in outward appearance, but in Nature chang'd, by the Omnipotency of God is made Flesh.* And again, *Returning from the Devils Altar they approach the Holy One of our Lord with foul and defil'd Hands. Over-charg'd with the killing and poisonous Meat of Idols, they invade the Body of our Lord with Mouths, even yet breathing their Wickedness, and exhaling infectious Contagion——They offend their Lord more with their defil'd Mouths and Hands, than they did when they deny'd him.* Can the Hands and Mouth distinguish Figures? Or can they reach or invade the Body of our Lord, unless it be really and substantially in the Blessed Sacrament?

l. 3. de Trinit.

(4.) St. Hilary, a Father of the fourth Age, arguing against the Arians, who maintain'd only a moral Unity of Will, and not a natural and substantial one between the Father and the Son, makes use of the natural and substantial Union of Christ with us in the Blessed Sacrament, to prove a natural and substantial Unity between the Father and the Son in these Words. *I ask those who alledge only an Unity of Will between the Father and the Son, whether Christ, is now in us by Truth of Nature, or by Agreement of Will? For if the Word was made truly Flesh, and we truly receive the Word made Flesh in the Meat of our Lord: How can it be thought but that Christ is naturally in us.*—And a little after upon those Words (my Flesh is truly Meat, my Blood is truly Drink, he that eats my Flesh, and drinks my Blood, remains in me, and I in him) he has these Words. *Concerning the Truth of Christ's Flesh and Blood, there's no room left for Doubt, for now both according to his Profession and our Faith, there's truly Flesh, and truly Blood, and these being received and swallowed, make us to be in Christ, and Christ in us, Is not this Truth? May it befall them not to think it Truth, who think Jesus Christ not to be true God.* And a little farther on, *This is the cause why we have Life, that in us being Carnal (or in our carnal Bodies) we have Christ remaining by his Flesh, being to live by him as he lives by his Father.* That is, not only by a moral, but a natural Union also, as is several times by this Holy Father express'd. And unless we understand him so, instead of the greatest Champion of the Catholick Church against the

the *Arians* at that time, we make him the weakest and most frivolous Reasoner in the World. For his Argument in the figurative Sense, would amount to no more than this, Christ is only figuratively in us by means of the Blessed Eucharist. Therefore he's naturally and substantially in the Father. What a Consequence for the great St. *Hilary* to make?

(5.) St. *Cyrill*, Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, a Father of the same Age, Catechizing those who were newly Baptiz'd, has these Words. Our Lord the Night he was deliver'd to his Enemies, having taken Bread, and given Thanks to God, he brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, take, Eat; this is my Body. Afterwards taking the Chalice, and giving Thanks, he said, this is my Blood. Christ therefore himself, saying, of Bread this is my Body, whoever after dares Question it? And the same affirming, and saying of Wine; this is my Blood, who will call it in Doubt, and say it is not his Blood? In Cana of Galilee he chang'd Water into Wine with the sole Power of his Will. And shall he be unworthy to gain our Belief that he changed Wine into his Blood? If being invited to a corporeal Marriage he wrought an astonishing Miracle, ought we not for much greater Reason acknowledge that he has given his Body and Blood to the Children of the Spouse. Wherefore let us receive the Body and Blood of Christ with all Certainty. For under the Type of Bread is given his Body, and under the Type of Wine is given his Blood. So we are made Christ's Bearers, that is, carrying Christ when we receive his Body and Blood into our Members. Do not therefore think of mere Bread and Wine. For they are the Body and Blood of Christ according to his own Word. And although Sense suggest this to you, judge not by your Taste, but hold with an assured Faith, and without any doubt that they are the Body and Blood of Christ, which are given you. Is this a proper Catechism for a Protestant Minister, who is positive that a change of Bread into Christ's Body, is absolutely impossible, whatever he is told of the change of Water into Wine; who earnestly contends that the entrance of Christ's Body into our corporeal Organs is unworthy his Divine Majesty; who maintains we are always to believe our Senses, unless we will overthrow all the Method of establishing Divine Faith; Is this I say a proper Catechism for a Protestant Minister, or a Roman Catholick Priest?

(6.) St. *Basil*, a Father of the same Age, has these Words. I. 2. de Bapt. Our Lord saying something greater than the Temple is, here instructs us, that he is much more Impious and Wicked, who being guilty of Impurity dares offer in Sacrifice the Body of our Lords, who has given himself a fragrant Oblation and Hoast for us, by how much the Body of the only begotten Son of God is more excellent than Rams and Bulls.

Bulls? More excellent, I say, not by Reason of Comparison. For the Excellence is incomparable, which certainly it were not, if the Sacrifice of our Saviour's Body and Blood, offer'd by his Priests were only Figures of our Lord's real Body. For according to that, Rams and Bulls were Figures of the same, as well as this.

(7.) St. Gregory of Nissa, the worthy Brother of St. Basil, and a Father of the same Age, in his Catechistical Discourse teaches, That being we consist of a double Substance, of Soul and Body, we stand in need of being united to the Source of Life according to both: He declares this Source of Life to be no other than that Body which by its Resurrection was shewn to be more powerful than Death, and that this Body cannot be any other way sufficiently united to us, as a necessary Antidote against the Poison of Sin, which has infected both Body and Soul, unless it be received by way of Meat within our Bodies, and admitted into our Bowels. He omits not, nor is he frightened with the Difficulty (which Protestants make such a Bugbear of) how it can be that this Body, which is distributed to so many Thousands of the Faithful over all the World, can be whole in every one partaking of it, and yet remain whole in it self. He maintains, That Bread was turn'd into this Body two ways, by Eating, and by those Words of Consecration: This is my Body. That thereby the Nature of those Things which appear is Transfemented into this Body. In fine, he has these Words. Therefore I rightly believe, that Bread now Consecrated by the Word of God, is changed into the Body of God the Word. Can any Roman Catholick say more?

(8.) St. Chrysostom, a Father of the same Age, has these Words. Let us in all Things believe God, and not Contradict him, tho' what he says seems contrary to our own Thoughts and Eyes, but let his Word prevail over both our Thoughts and Eyes. And so let us do in the Mysteries, not regarding only what's propos'd, but relying on his Word. For his Word cannot deceive, but our Sense is easily deceiv'd. He never Errs, but is often mistaken. Since his Word therefore says, this is my Body, let us be perswaded of it, and believe it, and behold it with our intellectual Eyes.—How many now a-days are apt to say, O that I might see his Form, his Shape, his Cloaths, or Shoes? Behold you see him, you touch him, you eat him. You desire to see his Cloaths. But he allows you not only to see himself, but to touch him, to eat him, and to take him even within you.—It's not enough for him to be made Man, to be scourg'd with Whips, to be put to Death for us, unless he also mix himself with us, and make us his Body, not by Faith only, but in reality. What is there that he who partakes of this Sacrament, ought not to exceed in Purity, what Rays of the
SUN

*Hom. 84. in
Matt.*

Sun ought not that Hand to excel which divides this Flesh, that Mouth which is fill'd with this Spiritual Fire, that Tongue which is imbued with the Purple of this dreadful Blood? We are nourished with that which the Angels see with Trembling, and which they cannot stedfastly behold without being dazl'd with its Splendor. And yet we are reduced into one Mass, we are made one Body, and one Flesh with him, who can express the Power of our Lord, who can sufficiently sound forth his Praise? What Shepherd ever fed his Flock with his own Flesh? Shepherd do I say? Many Mothers deliver their tender Infants to other Nurses; but he does not so, he Nourishes us with his own Flesh, and every way Unites himself to us.—The Things before us are not the Effects of Human Power. He who performed them in the last Supper performs them now, we hold the Place of his Ministers, but he is the Person who sanctifies and changes them.

(9.) The same Father in his 24th Homily upon the 1st to the Corinthians, explicating that of St Paul, *The Chalice of Benediction* which we bless, is it not a Communication of Christ's Blood? Has these Words. He said very faithfully, and very terribly; and what he said is this. That which is in the Chalice is that which flow'd from his Side, and we partake of it. This Mystery makes Earth Heaven. For what is most precious and honourable there, I shew you here upon Earth: For as it is not the stately Edifice, or gilded Roof, which is most Magnificent in an Earthly Prince's Court, but the Body of the King sitting upon his Throne; so in Heaven is the Body of the King. And this you may now see upon Earth, and not only see it, but touch it, but eat it, and return home with it. Whereupon in the 3d. Book of Priesthood he has these Words, O Miracle, O wonderful Goodness! He who sits above with the Father at the same Instant is managed by the Hands of all, and delivers himself to such as desire to receive and embrace him.

(10.) St. Ambrose, a Father of the same Age, has these Words, *L. de iis qui* Consider with your self whether is most Excellent, the Bread of Angels myst. initi. or the Flesh of Christ, which surely is the Body of Life? That was from Heaven; this surpasses Heaven. That was subject to Corruption, if kept a Day above the Time; this so incorruptible, that whoever religiously tastes it, becomes exempt from Corruption. Water issued out of a Rock for them; Blood issues out of Christ for you. Those things happen'd to them in Figure of what was to be fulfill'd in us. You know whether's better. Light is better than the Shadow, Truth than the Figure, the Body of the Creator than the Heavenly Manna. Perhaps you'll say I see another thing; how can you tell me it is the Body of Christ which I receive? This therefore remains for me to prove. And how many Examples do we make use of to prove, That it is not what Nature form'd, but what the Benediction Consecrated,
and

and that the Power of the Benediction is greater than that of Nature, because Nature it self is changed by the Benediction! Moses held a Rod in his Hand: He threw down the Rod and it was made a Serpent. Again, he took hold of the Tail of the Serpent, and it return'd into the Nature of a Rod. You see therefore, that by Prophetick Grace, Nature was twice chang'd, the Serpent's Nature and the Rod's. The Rivers of Ægypt ran clear Streams of Water: Immediately Bloodburst out of the Veins of their Fountains. There was no Drink in the Rivers: And again, at the Prophet's Prayers, the Blood of the Rivers ceas'd, and the Nature of the Waters return'd.—Now if Human Benediction had such force as to change Nature, what shall we say of the Divine Consecration, when the Words of our Lord and Saviour work the effect? For the Sacrament which you receive is effected by the Words of Christ. It is said of all the Works of the Creation, That he Spake, and they were Made: He Commanded and they were Created. The Word therefore of Christ, which could make out of nothing what was not, cannot it change the Things which are into what they were not? For it is no less a matter to give new Natures to Things than it is to change them—Our Lord Jesus proclaims aloud, This is my Body. Before the Consecration of the Heavenly Words are named the Species, (or specific Natures) After the Consecration 'tis signifi'd to be the body of Christ. He declares it his Blood. Before the Consecration it's said to be another thing; after the Consecration it's call'd Blood. And you say Amen; that is, it's true what the Mouth speaks, let the Soul confess; what the Word imports, let the Affection perceive. What Expressions! What Proofs! How plain and how full!

L. 9. Confess.
c. 13.

(11.) St. Austin, a Father of the fifth Age, speaking of his Dying-Mother, has these Words. She desir'd to be remember'd at thy Altar which she dayly attended, from whence she knew the Holy Victim, wherewith was Cancell'd the Hand-writing against us, was dispens'd. And lest it should be pretended that the Figure only of that Holy Victim was dispens'd from the Altar; He overthrows such Pretence in explicating those Words of the 88th Psalm: Adore his Footstool, where he has these Words. I enquire what is his Footstool, and the Scripture tells me: The Earth is my Footstool. Doubtful with my self, I turn to Christ: For here I find him, and (in him) how Earth may be adored without Impiety; how without Impiety his Footstool may be ador'd? For he took upon him Earth from Earth: Because Flesh is from Earth, and he took upon him Flesh from the Flesh of Mary. And because he convers'd with us here in Flesh, and gave us that very Flesh to eat for our Salvation, and no Body eats that Flesh unless he has first ador'd it: Hereby it's found out how such a Footstool of our Lord may be ador'd, and that we

we do not only not Sin in adoring it, but we Sin if we do not adore it. Hence is form'd this Argument: We adore (according to St. *Austin*) without Impiety, what we eat; What we adore without Impiety is the Body of Christ, that very Flesh which he took from the Blessed Virgin *Mary*; Therefore what we eat is the Body of Christ, that very Flesh he took from the Blessed Virgin *Mary*. Unless it must be maintain'd (which never was by Christian) that a Figure be to be adored with such Adoration as cannot be without Impiety, that is, a Sovereign Adoration proper to God alone. Moreover it is impossible to verify these Words upon a figurative Eating, that is, an apprehending of Christ by Faith, as having suffered for us, because he must be apprehended so by Faith before he can in such Consideration be Ador'd, not Ador'd before he is in such Consideration apprehended. Unless St. *Austin* must be suppos'd to Teach People to Adore they know not what.

12. He again overthrows such pretence in explicating the 33d Psalm, *And he was carry'd in his Hands: As for this, Brethren,* ^{Expl. in Psal. 33.} *How can any body understand it to be performed by Man? For who is carried in his own Hands? A Man may be carried in another's Hands, but no Body is carried in his own. How according to the Letter it can be understood in the Person of David, we cannot find out, but we find out how it can be understood in the Person of Christ. For Christ was carried in his Hands, when commending his own very Body, he said, This is my Body: For he then carried that Body in his Hands. Can we imagine the flaming willed St. *Austin*, would have been so puzzled in finding how David might have carried his own Picture, if at the very same time (according to Protestants) he intended to say no more, than Christ carried his?*

13. St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, another Father of the fifth Age, ^{Cyr. Alex. l. 4.} speaking of the Blessed Eucharist, has these Words. *Why is it con-* ^{Nest.} *stantly planted in us? Is it not that it may make Christ inhabit in us, even c. 5. Corporally by Participation and Communion of his Holy Flesh? Excellently well! For St. Paul writes, That the Gentils are made Con-corporeal, Com-participal and Co-heirs of Christ. And how are they made Con-corporeal? to wit, by Participation of the honoured Eucharist, they are made one Body with him, as well as every one of the Apostles. — Our Saviour also himself, says, He who Eats my Flesh and Drinks my Blood, remains in me and I in him. Here it is worth our time to consider, That Christ does not say he would be in us in regard of Affection, but by natural Participation. For as when a Man joyns two pieces of Wax and melts them down together, he makes one Thing of them both: So by participation of Christ's Body and precious Blood, we are united, he in us and we in him. For no other way*

can what is Corruptible be Enliven'd, than by being Corporally united to the Body of him who is Life itself, that is, of the only Begotten Son.

14. St. Leo the Great, another Father of the fifth Age, has these Words. Christ saying, unless you Eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink his Blood, you shall not have Life in you: You ought in such manner partake of this Holy Table, as not to doubt the Truth of Christ's Body and Blood. For that is received by the Mouth which is believed by Faith: And those Persons answer Amen in vain, who dispute against what they receive. Pray God the conclusion of this Testimony and the latter end of St. Hilarie's, may be seriously and cordially consider'd.

15. St. Gregory the Great, a Father of the sixth Age, has these Words. What the Blood of Christ is, you have learnt not by Hearing, but by Drinking. Which Blood is plac'd upon both Posts when it is Drunk, not only by the Mouth of the Body, but also by the Mouth of the Heart.

16. These Fathers having been always held in Veneration, and followed by those who succeeded them, their Successors Judgment may reasonably be suppos'd the same as theirs, and farther Trouble hereupon easily dispens'd with. I have mark'd the beginning and the end of the Father's Words with Strokes: I was forc'd to make use of Notes, not having the Originals by me: But if any thing be excepted against as defective in the Translation, upon due Notice, I'll take it into Consideration.

17. Now besides the Remarks made occasionally as I pass'd, there are three Rules, whereby the proper and natural Expressions of sincere, prudent and rational Persons (such as we ought to esteem our Saviour and the Fathers abovementioned, interpreting his Words) may be distinguish'd from those that are Figurative and Metaphorical: And according to these Rules, both our Saviour's and these Fathers Words, are to be understood not in the Figurative and Metaphorical, but in the Proper and Natural Sense and Signification.

18. The first of these Rules is this, That although those Things which have a natural Likeness and Resemblance with other Things, may be called other Things Figuratively and Metaphorically, without offence to Sincerity, Prudence and Reason: Yet signs of Institution cannot be call'd so till the Institution be known, without offence to the same. For Example, should a Stranger to the Laws of the Jews, have enquir'd of them what the Paschal Lamb and the Manna was: They could not without offence to Sincerity, Prudence and Reason, have told him abruptly, and without impor-

importing the Institutive Signification, That the *Paschal Lamb* was the Victim, wherewith were effac'd the Sins of the World; and the *Manna* was the Antidote of Immortality, which intic'd us to Incorruption and Resurrection to Eternal Life: Because thereby they would have given him an occasion of judging erroneously, that the *Paschal Lamb* and the *Manna* had those Virtues in themselves, without any farther regard.

In like manner, if the *Bread and Wine* were no more than a Sign of Institution of our Saviour's *Body and Blood*; our Saviour without informing us of such Institution, which he never does, could not have told us they were his *Body* which was deliver'd for us, and his *Blood* which was spilt for us, without the like Danger: Nor could St. *Justin* speaking to an Heathen Emperor, nor St. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, St. *Gregory* of *Nyssa*, St. *Ambrose* speaking to the Children and newly Baptized (all which Persons had heard nothing of such Institution) have call'd *Bread and Wine* our Saviour's *Body and Blood*, how contrary soever they appear'd to Sense and Reason, without offending Sincerity, Prudence and Reason. Therefore their Words are to be understood not in the Figurative and Metaphorical, but in the proper and natural Sense and Signification.

19. The second Rule is this, That Signs of Institution being Easie and Arbitrary, for Example of a Vintner setting up an Ivy-Bush to signify his Wine, or of an Ale-Wife setting up a Birch to signify her Ale: No Body can Admire, Commend and Extol them as such, without offence to Sincerity, Prudence and Reason; or indeed without rendring himself ridiculous. If *Bread and Wine* therefore, or the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, be no more than a Sign of Institution of our Saviour's *Body and Blood*, How cou'd he Commend and Extol it above the Heavenly *Manna*, without offence to Sincerity, Prudence and Reason, or without exposing his Divine Wisdom upon this Account? Or how cou'd the Fathers cry out Wonder and Miracle, without rendring themselves extreamly Ridiculous? Their Words therefore are not to be understood Figuratively and Metaphorically, but Naturally and Properly.

20. The third Rule is this, That Figurative and Metaphorical Expressions not importing really what they sound, no body can without offence to Sincerity, Prudence and Reason, make use of strong and miraculous Proofs and Instances to recommend them. How unworthy then our Saviour's Wisdom was it, to make use of the miraculous Multiplication of the Loaves, to recommend this Sign of Institution, if it was no more than such? How unworthy

And then

the Wisdom of those Oracles of their Ages, the Fathers, to alledge the Miracles of *Moses*, of the Incarnation of the Creation of Heaven and Earth, to prove the *Bread and Wine* were instituted for Signs, and no more, of our Saviour's *Body and Blood*? Their Words therefore are not to be understood in the Figurative and Metaphorical, but in the proper and natural Sense and Signification.

Themselves, without any other regard
In like manner, if the Bread and Wine were no more than a
Sign of Institution of our Saviour's Body and Blood, our Saviour
without informing us of such Institution, which he never does,
could not have told us they were his Body which was delivered
for us, and his Blood which was shed for us, without the like
Danger: Nor could St. John speaking to an Heathen Emperor,
not St. Cyprian of Jerusalem, St. Cyprian of Carthage, St. Ambrose of Milan,
and to the Children and newly Baptized (all which Persons had
heard nothing of such Institution) have said Bread and Wine are
Saviour's Body and Blood, how contrary looked they appeared to

Reason. Therefore their Words are to be understood not in the
Figurative and Metaphorical, but in the proper and natural Sense
and Signification.

The second Rule is this: That Signs of Institution being
Evident and Arbitrary, for Example of a Minister taking up an Eul-
Bath to signify his Wine, or of an Ale-Wine taking up a Pitch to
signify his Ale: The Body can Administer, Command, and Exhort
them as such, without offence to sincerity, Prudence and Reason;
or indeed without rendering himself ridiculous. If Bread and

N A

more than a Sign of Institution of our Saviour's Body and Blood,
How could he Command and Exhort it above the Heavenly Man,
without offence to sincerity, Prudence and Reason, or without
expelling his Divine Will upon this Account? Or how could
the Father say our Wonder and Miracle, without rendering them-
selves extremely ridiculous? Their Words therefore are not to
be understood figuratively and Metaphorically, but Naturally
and Literally.

The third Rule is this: That Figurative and Metaphorical
Expressions are not importing really what they seem, no body can
without offence to sincerity, Prudence and Reason, make use of
strong and ridiculous Figures and allusions to recommend them.
How unworthy then our Saviour's Wisdom was, to make use of
the inaction Multiplication of the Loaves, to recommend the
Sign of Institution, if it was no more than such? How unworthy

A N
A N S W E R
 T O S O M E
 Testimonies produced by *T. B.*
 FROM THE
F A T H E R S
 O F T H E
 Six First Centuries,
 F O R
TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

§. 1. **T**HAT I may proceed more clearly in examining those Testimonies, which *T. B.* hath Collected out of the Fathers, as he pretends, against the Doctrin of the Church of *England*, and for that Doctrin of the Church of *Rome*, deliver'd in the 13th Sess. c. 4. of the *Trent* Council. I shall

1. Premise the true State of the Controversy between us, that it may more plainly appear what is for us, and what against us.

2. Lay down some Rules by which I think and suppose *T. B.* will also judge it reasonable, to examine the Father's Testimonies. And then

3. Pro-

3. Proceed to consider every particular Testimony in the order *T. B.* cites them.

§ 2. (1.) It had been but equitable if, as I laid down the Doctrin of the Church of *Rome* in the Words of her *Trent Council*, before I propos'd my Reasons against it; so *T. B.* had premis'd his Discourse against the Doctrin of the Church of *England*, by laying down that in the Words of her Articles or Liturgy: And then he would not, as he seems to do in this Discourse, Fight against a Phantome of his own making. For he all along supposes that we teach the sacramental Elements to be empty Signs, that we deny any real Participation of Christ's Body and Blood in them, or a real change by the Consecration of them. Let him then hear the Language of our Church in her 28th Article. *The Supper of the Lord, is not only a Sign of the Love that Christians ought to have among themselves, one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death. Inasmuch, that to such as Rightly, Worthily and with Faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. Then declaring against Transubstantiation, she adds, The Body of Christ is Given, Taken and Eaten in the Supper, only after an Heavenly and Spiritual Manner. And the means whereby the Body is Receiv'd and Eaten in the Supper, is Faith.* In the 29th Article she declares, *That the Wicked and such as be void of a lively Faith, altho' they carnally and visibly Press with their Teeth (as St. Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather to their Condemnation do Eat and Drink the Sign and Sacrament of so great a Thing.* Next hear what she Teaches in her Catechism, *That in a Sacrament there are Two Things, the Outward and Visible Sign, and the Inward and Spiritual Grace: That the Outward Part of the Lord's Supper is Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath Commanded to be Received: And that the Inward Part or Thing signified, is the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed Taken and Received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper.* Hence it is manifest, that our Church holds a Real, tho' not a Carnal, a Spiritual and Heavenly, tho' not a Corporal Participation of Christ's Body and Blood; which tho' Locally and Naturally in Heaven, yet after a Mystical and Spiritual Way, is Communicated to the Faithful, not by the Mouth of the Body, but by that of Faith. Hence in the Exhortation before the Communion, she declares, *That the worthy Receiver spiritually Eats the Flesh of Christ and Drinks his Blood, Dwells in Christ and Christ in him, is one with Christ and Christ with him.*

§. 3. Hence it is evident, That all Protestants believe a real and great Change in the Elements upon Consecration, tho' not in their Substance, yet in their Use, Condition and Office, and that this sacramental and supernatural Change, is not effected without a supernatural and divine Power; to which only it belongs to institute Sacraments, and to make them efficacious for the Communicating of Spiritual Grace. And if after this T. B. remember that the Doctrin of his Church is, *That the Substance of Bread and Wine are changed into the Substance of Christ's Body and Blood, so that only the Accidents of Bread and Wine remain without their Substance;* He may (would he be Impartial) perceive without more labour, that not one of his Testimonies out of the Fathers, disprove the Doctrin of our Church, or prove his; but rather agree very well with the former, and are repugnant to the latter. But because I fear he will Wink hard, rather than See what he likes not, I will make another Attempt toward the Opening of his Eyes.

§. 4. (2.) By laying down some Propositions, by which it must be allowed reasonable to Examine the Testimonies of the Fathers.

1. Those Terms in the Writings of the Fathers expressing a Change in the Eucharist, which are used also by them to express the Change that is made in the *Re-generation of a Sinner*, in the *Water of Baptism*, in the *Ordination of a Priest*, or in the *Consecration of an Altar*, or the *Chrism*, cannot prove Transubstantiation in the Eucharist. For then they would prove as well a Transubstantiation in the *Water of Baptism*, in a *Priest* ordained, a *Sinner* converted, or an *Altar* or *Chrism* consecrated.

2. Those Passages in the Fathers, that speak of *eating Christ's Flesh in Baptism*, and in *hearing the Word* as well as in the Eucharist, cannot prove Transubstantiation in the Eucharist any more than in Baptism, and hearing the Word.

3. Those Passages out of the Fathers, that Caution us not to trust wholly to *our Senses in Baptism*, as much as in the Eucharist, cannot favour Transubstantiation, nor dis-countenance the Testimony of our Senses against it.

4. Those Passages of the Fathers, which cannot countenance Transubstantiation in the Eucharist, without proving a Transubstantiation in the *Incarnation*, cannot reasonably be urged in that Sense.

5. Those Passages out of the Fathers, which prove the Substance of the Elements remain after Consecration, cannot countenance Transubstantiation, which supposes them to be changed into the Substance of Christ's Body and Blood; Nay, those Passages

ages that affirm nothing of the substance of the Elements receding from the Accidents, amount not to the Proof of Transubstantiation, which supposes Accidents without their Subject.

6. Hyperbolical and Catechistical strains of Oratory in some Homilies of the Fathers, which in a strict literal Sense are not true even in the Judgment of a *Romanist*, are no good Proofs of Transubstantiation, or indeed of any Doctrin whatsoever. Especially

7. Lastly, When the same Fathers in other Tracts, wherein their Business is to deliver Doctrins dogmatically and plainly for Instruction, without such Rhetorical Schemes, they lay down plain Positions inconsistent with Transubstantiation.

§. 5. (3.) These Propositions are very reasonable, and according to them I proceed to a more particular Examination of *T. B's* Testimonies out of the Fathers in the same Order, wherein he cites them.

Ign. ep. ad Smyrn.

§. 6. (1.) He begins with *Ignatius*, concerning some Hereticks, *that received not Eucharists or Oblations, because they confess not the Eucharist to be the Flesh of Christ.*

T. B. §. 1.

The Hereticks he means, were the Followers of *Simon and Menander*, who denied the reality of Christ's Flesh, and for that Reason admitted not the Eucharist. And what is this to Transubstantiation, that some Hereticks, because they did not believe that Christ was really Incarnate, would not admit the Eucharist, the Symboles whereof represented and supposed a real Incarnation? Heresie is prolifick of Heresie, and their Dis-belief of the Incarnation made them reject the Eucharist, lest they should be forced to confess the Flesh of Christ. For if they allowed the Symboles of a true Body, they would be obliged to grant a true Body, since a meer Phantome can have no Sign or Symbole. Thus your Cardinal *Bellarmino* answers for us, *Lest the Calvinists* (says he) *should Glory of the Antiquity of their Opinion, it is to be observed, that those ancient Hereticks did not so much oppose the Eucharist as the Mystery of the Incarnation. For therefore (as Ignatius shews in the same place) they denied the Eucharist to be the Flesh of the Lord, because they denied the Lord to have Flesh. If then in the Judgment of your Cardinal these Hereticks were no Calvinists, Ignatius in condemning them, neither condemns Calvinists, nor countenances Transubstantiators: What we teach, that the Elements are Sacramental Sigas of Christ's Body, is as inconsistent with the Sentiments of those Hereticks as Transubstantiation, since such Figures of a Body (as Tertullian argues against the Marcionites) prove the Reality of Christ's Flesh, and that it was*

Bellarmin. de Euchar. l. 1. c. 1. p. 400.

no

no Phantome, which can have no Figure. I may add, That *Theodoret*, out of whose third Dialogue this Passage of *Ignatius* is restored (which was not to be found in former Editions of *Ignatius*) hath plainly declared against the *Eurychians* (as I have formerly observed) that the Symboles after Consecration recede not from their own Nature, but remain in their former Substance. And he must have a very mean Opinion of *Theodore's* Judgment, who can think he imagined this Passage of *Ignatius* inconsistent with his own Opinion; which wou'd have been to have helped the Hereticks instead of confuting them. To conclude, examine this Testimony by the latter part of my fifth Rule, and shew us where *Ignatius* says a Word of the changing of the Substance of the Bread into the Substance of Christ's Body: Which is the Doctrine of the *Trent Council*, and what *T. B.* was to prove.

§. 7. (2.) *Justin Martyr* is produced next, whose Words in *T. B. §. 2.* his second Apology to *Antoninus* I have consulted, and find them to run thus. For we do not receive these as common Bread or common Drink, but as Jesus Christ our Saviour, being made Flesh by the Word of God, had both Flesh and Blood for our Salvation, so also we are taught that the Food, which hath been (*εὐχαριστήσαν*) sanctified by the Prayer of his Word, by which (*ἵνα ἡμεῖς τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος*) our Blood and Flesh by change are nourished, is both the Flesh and Blood of the Incarnate Jesus. This I undertake to be a faithful and full Translation of this Passage of *Justin Martyr*, which cannot be affirmed of *T. B.'s*. And concerning it I have these Remarks to make, which must convince *T. B.* if he be convincible, that it makes nothing for Transubstantiation.

§. 8. 1. Whereas *T. B.* produces this as a clear Evidence for Transubstantiation, I desire him to consider, that it is cited out of a Writing of that Father's, directed to an Heathen Emperor, and then to tell me how it is consistent with what he affirms of the Primitive Fathers Care to conceal this Mystery from the Heathens. For if that be so, we may conclude *Justin* was not such a Blab as here on purpose to divulge the Matter. And well we may, for

§. 9. 2. He says, We do not receive these as common Bread or common Drink. Therefore Bread and Drink, tho' not Common but Sacramental. Concerning which, take the Words of *Irenaeus* as a very proper Comment on them. The Bread, says he, *gen. 1. 4.* which is from the Earth, receiving the Divine Invocation is not common Bread, but the Eucharist consisting of Two Things, an Earthly and an Heavenly. Sure then the Earthly part is not taken away, the Substance of the Elements is not annihilated to make room

for the Heavenly. For then there would be but one, not two Things in the Eucharist. To which add, that it is common for the Fathers to say of Water in *Baptism*, that it is not *common* Water, by which they suppose it to remain Water still, after it is consecrated into a Sacrament, and by Parity of Reason the Bread consecrated, tho' not *Common Bread*, remains Bread still. I know some Popish Authors suppose the Earthly part in *Irenaus* to be the Accidents; but as he says no such Thing, so that cannot be supposed of the Elements in *Justin Martyr*, raised by Consecration above common Bread. For

Irenaus l. 5.
c. 12.

§. 10. 3. He affirms, That those Elements after Consecration, by Change nourish our Body and Blood. Now as *T. B.* I suppose will not say, that our Body and Blood are nourished by the Substance of Christ's Body and Blood (which were to make himself and the Holy Father *Stercorarians*) so I am sure bare Accidents destitute of Substance cannot increase our Substance, nor consequently nourish our Bodies. *Irenaus* affirms positively, That the Substance of our Body is increas'd by the *Bread and Wine*, which are the *Body and Blood* of Christ, and sure *T. B.* will not pretend that the Substance of our Body can be increas'd by bare Accidents: For he may as well pretend to feed an hungry Man by Words, or quench his Thirst by Musick. So that it appears from these two last Remarks, that according to my fifth Rule, this Testimony proving no change in the Substance of the Elements, but the contrary, can be no Proof of Transubstantiation.

§. 11. 4. *T. B.* seems to lay a great Stress on those Words, *In the same manner (as τὸν αὐτόν, which I render as)* If then in the same manner as Christ is made Flesh, the Elements are made the Body and Blood of Christ; it will follow, that there is an Hypostatical Union in the Eucharist as well as in the Incarnation; Yea, and it will follow, — That in the same manner that the Elements are made the Body and Blood of Christ, Christ is made Flesh. Suppose then that the Elements are made Christ's Body and Blood by Transubstantiation, then it follows, That Christ was also made Flesh by Transubstantiation. But if any should affirm, That Christ at his Incarnation was Transubstantiated, I presume *T. B.* would joyn with me in pronouncing him an Heretick. And consequently by my fourth Rule, this Testimony is no Proof of a Transubstantiation in the Eucharist.

§. 12. 5. This then is the true Sense of this Father, That as Christ was truly Incarnate, so we are taught that the Elements consecrated by the Word, and still remaining in their own Nature,

ture, whereby our Flesh and Blood are nourished, is truly Christ's Body and Blood, as to all the spiritual Uses of a Sacrament. Nor would this sound strange in the Ears of Heathens (to whom this Apology is directed) who were wont to hear the Statues of their Gods called by the Names of their Gods themselves.

§. 13. (3.) T. B. in the next place produces Two Testimonies (as he pretends) out of St. Cyprian, tho' but one of them can justly pretend to so venerable a Name.

The first T. B. cites under the Title *de Cæna*, whence I infer T. B. §. 3. that he never consulted the Author himself, but takes all upon Trust. For there is one piece entituled, *de Cæna*, which, Du Pin, calls, *A ridiculous and impertinent Book*; and another *de Cæna Domini*, and out of this latter I find, that the Passage cited by T. B. under the other Title, is taken.

§. 14. Now this Book, *De Cardinalibus Christi Operibus*, in which the Tract *de Cæna Domini* is a part, is by all Learned Papists acknowledged not to be St. Cyprian's: And Du Pin, tells us, *Du Pin vol. 1. That upon the Faith of several Manuscripts it hath been restored to p. 141. Arnoldus Bonævallis, Contemporary and Friend of St. Bernard, who address'd it to Pope Adrian IV. Now if T. B. knew this (as he ought to have done before he produced his Testimony for a piece of venerable Antiquity) I cannot but complain of his Disingenuity for bringing in a Testimony out of the Twelfth Century next to Justin Martyr. But I have so good an Opinion of T. B. that I am content rather to suppose him (as I had rather be accounted my self) Ignorant than Disingenuous.*

However, taking this for an Author of the Twelfth Age, I will consider his Testimony, and prove that he is no Friend to Transubstantiation by alledging some other Passages in the same Tract, that Discountenance it, and then by solving the Arguments that seem to favour it in the Passage alledg'd by T. B.

§. 15. 1. He stiles the consecrated Bread (*Panis substantialis*) substantial Bread, and therefore never dream'd that it was then only Phantastical Bread, meer Accidents covering the Substance of Christ. Speaking afterward of Judas, he says, *As soon as his perfidious Mind touched the Holy Meat, and the sanctified Bread entered into his wicked Mouth, the Parricide's Soul could not bear the force of so great a Sacrament, which Words intimate only a Sacramental Change in the consecrated Elements. Especially considering that a little after he gives this Reason why it is called Bread (Propter nutrimenti congruentiam) for its fitness to Nourish us: And adds, That common Bread being changed into Flesh and Blood, procures Life and Increase to our Bodies, and so the weakness of our Faith, being helped by the usual Effect of Things, is taught by*

a sensible Argument, that the Effect of Eternal Life is in the visible Sacrament, and that we are united to Christ (*non tam Corporali quam Spirituali transiione*) not by a Bodily but a Spiritual Change. All which agrees much better with the Doctrin of our Church, than the Roman. Especially taking with it what follows in the Oxford Edition of St. Cyprian, left out by Pamelius, as not so agreeable with Transubstantiation; Christ calls this Sacrament sometimes *Flesh and Blood*, sometimes *Bread*, and sometimes his *Body*. *Bread* it is called (*propter Nutrimentum vitæ*) for its vital Nourishment, *Flesh and Blood* for the Truth of his Nature, and his *Body* for the Unity of Substance. If the *Bread* in the Sacrament nourish Life, it retains its own Substance still. And now I come to

§. 16. 2. The Passage it self cited by T. B. in these Words, *The Bread, which our Lord gave to his Disciples, not in outward appearance, but in Nature chang'd, by the Omnipotence of God is made Flesh*. Before I give the true Sense of these Words, I shall subjoin the Words that immediately follow in this Tract. And as in the Person of Christ the Humanity only was seen, and the Divinity lay hid, so the Divine Essence in an ineffable manner insuses it self into the visible Sacrament. For hence it appears, That this Author no more meant by the preceding Passage, that only the outward appearance of the Elements were left in the Sacrament, than that only the outward appearance of Christ's Humanity was left in his Person: And if the Substance of Christ's Humanity remained in his Person, by the force of that Similitude, the Substance of the Bread must remain too in the visible Sacrament.

§. 17. And this premised, I come to the Difficulties in the Words themselves, *Non effigie sed natura mutatus*, and *Omnipotentia verbi factus Caro*.

For the first Difficulty, I think it very reasonable to explain this Author by himself; who toward the beginning of this Tract hath these Words, *That this Food of Immortality differs from common Meat, in that it retains (Corporalis substantiæ speciem) the kind or specifick Nature of its bodily Substance, but proves the Presence of a Divine Virtue by its invisible Efficiency, i. e. It is common Bread as to all outward appearance, and of the same kind as to its bodily Substance, but changed as to its supernatural Efficiency*. So that by *Effigies* he means the Species of his bodily Substance, and by *Nature* not the Substance, but the Condition and Use. For—1. If we take *Nature* here for the Substance, it is a flat Contradiction to St. Chrysostome in his Epistle to Casarius, to Theodoret in his Dialogues, and Gelasius cited at large in a former

mer Paper, who all expressly affirm, That the Elements recede not from their own Nature, but remain in their former Substance. And then we have the Authority of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries to confront the Twelfth.—2dly, It is not unusual in Latin Writers to express by Nature not the Substance, but the Properties and Condition of Things. I will only mention two Instances, one in the Latin Translator of St. Chrysostome, lib. de virt. & vitijs, who says, The Prophet Elijah could change (Naturam undarum) the Nature of the Water, that it could bear up Iron, tho' sure in that change of Nature the substance of the Water remained. The other is in St. Ambrose, who of the Water in Baptism, says, That the Nature is changed by the Benediction. Sure then the Change of Nature in Latin Writers does not imply a Transubstantiation, since no such Thing is pretended in the Water of Baptism. But

Ambr. de Sacram. & lib. de iis qui iniantur mysteriis, c. 9.

§. 18. Here comes a second Difficulty in these Words of the Pseudo-Cyprianus, that this Change in the Nature of Bread was made by the Omnipotence of the Word. To answer this Argument once for all, I offer to T. B. these Considerations.

1. That in the Scotch Liturgy, in the Prayer of Consecration is this Passage; Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and of thy Almighty Goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctifie with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy Gifts and Creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dear Son. When the Scots objected this Passage against Arch-
Arch-
bishop Laud as favouring a corporal Presence, he answers, Well, if these be the Words, how will they squeeze a corporal Presence out of them? Why, first the Change here is made a work of God's Omnipotence. Well, and a work of Omnipotence it is, whatever the

Hist. of Arch-
bishop Laud's
Troubles, published by Mr. Wharton, p. 121.

Change be. For less than Omnipotence cannot change those Elements either in Nature or Use to so high a Service as they are put in that great Sacrament, and therefore the invoking of God's Almighty Goodness to effect this by them, is no Proof at all of intending the corporal Presence of Christ in this Sacrament. To this add a Passage out of this Pseudo-Cyprian Arnoldus Boneval. in his Tract de Chrysmate, another part of this Book, de Operibus Christi Cardinalibus, wherein he thus speaks concerning the Sanctification of Oyl. The Elements being sanctified, its not now their own Nature that doth the Work, but (Potentia divina potentius operatur) the Power of God operates more powerfully. The Truth is joyned with the Sign, and the Spirit with the Sacrament. And yet this sure implies no Transubstantiation in the Chrysm. To which may
Leo Serm. 42. de Natu.
 be added, what Leo says of Baptism. Christ gave to the Water, what he gave to his Mother. For the Power of the most High,
 and

and the Overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, which made Mary to Conceive and Bear our Saviour, the same hath made the Water to Regenerate a Believer. So that by my first Rule this Testimony of Pseudo-Cyprianus, affirming no more of a Change in the Eucharist, than he and other more ancient Authors have said of Chrysm and Baptism, cannot amount to a Proof of Transubstantiation.

T. B. §. 3.

§. 19. T. B's second Testimony out of St. Cyprian (and all that can truly pretend to that venerable Authority) is out of his Sermon *de Lapsis*. The Passage is a Rhetorical Exaggeration of their Fault, that having Lapsed, come to the Communion without due Repentance. *Returning*, says he, *from the Altars of Devils, they approach the Holy One of the Lord with filthy and defiled Hands. Yet even belching the poisonous Meat of Idols, they invade the Body of our Lord with Jaws, yet exhaling their Wickedness, and breathing deadly Contagion.* Then (tho' T. B. omit it) he adds a threefold Proof of this Charge from Scripture, one from Lev. 22. 3. where he that having his Uncleanness upon him, Eats of the Holy Things, is threatned to be cut off from God's Presence: A second of St. Paul's, 1 Cor. 10. 21. *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's Table, and the Table of Devils;* And a third out of the same Epistle, C. 11. 27. *Whosoever shall eat this Bread, and drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, is guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.* Then the Father adds, *Having despised all these, they offer violence to his Body and Blood. They offend now their Lord more with their Hands and Mouth, than when they denied him.*

§. 20. On which T. B. makes this Reflection, *Can the Hands and Mouth distinguish Figures? Or can they reach or invade the Body of our Lord, unless it be really and substantially in the Blessed Sacrament?* I answer,

1. Suppose the Elements mere Figures (which I have shewed, is a Misrepresentation of our Doctrin) yet all St. Cyprian here says, may well enough be applied to the Prophaners of it. For might I not say of a drunken Fellow in his intemperate Frolicks abusing his Prince's Statue, that returning from a lewd House of Debauchery, overcharged with Surfeiting, and yet exhaling his Wickedness, he invades his King, to spit upon him, and defile him with his contagious Mouth, and that he offends him more with his defiled Mouth and Hands, than if he had disowned his Authority by an open Rebellion? What need then is there of a Transubstantiation to justify the Propriety of such a Rhetorical Scheme of Speech? May not the Mouth and the Hands abuse

abuse the Prince in abusing his Effigies? May they not reach to abuse his Person, tho' it be not transubstantiated into that Statue or Picture? St. Hierom on *Malachi* tells us, *Dum Sacramenta violantur, &c. When Sacraments are prophaned, he is abused whose the Sacraments are.* If any should be so Prophane as to Spit into the Font, he might be said to abuse Christ with his Mouth, tho' there be no Transubstantiation in that Laver of Regeneration.

§. 21. 2. The same St. Cyprian Ep. 2. l. 4. affirms, That a Sin committed voluntarily is much more hainous, than one to which he is compelled by Force and Necessity, and that on that account Adulterers are more hainous Offenders than the *Libellatici*: And by parity of Reason, he that Prophanes the Sacrament, to which he is not constrained by force, but approaches voluntarily, is in a more dangerous Case than he that through Weakness under Torments, gave up his Bible, or Sacrificed to an Idol.

§. 22. 3. If T. B. urge St. Cyprian's Words, *That he invades the Body of our Lord; Facundus*, Bishop of *Hermiana* in *Affrica*, a most faithful follower of St. Cyprian, that flourished A. D. 540. may explain him in a Passage preserved by *Phorins* in his *Bibliotheca* out of his Twelve Books, *de Defensione trium Capit.* tho' the rest of that Treatise be lost. Christ (says he) submitted to the Sacrament of Adoption, both when he was Circumcised and when he was Baptized; and the Sacrament of Adoption may be called Adoption; As we call the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, which is in the Consecrated Bread and Cup, his Body and Blood; not that the Bread is properly his Body and the Cup his Blood, but because they contain in them the Mystery of his Body and Blood. Hence also the Lord himself called the consecrated Bread and Cup which he deliver'd to his Disciples, his Body and his Blood. Wherefore as the Faithful receiving the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, are rightly said to receive his Body and Blood; so also Christ himself, when he received the Sacrament of the Adoption of Sons, might rightly be said to receive the Adoption of Sons. So that if *Facundus*, a professed Admirer of St. Cyprian, understood his Doctrine (as may be reasonably supposed) he meant nothing like Transubstantiation by calling the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, his Body and Blood. Nay

§. 23. 4. If St. Cyprian be allowed to be able to deliver his own Sentiments, what he delivers dogmatically in other places, ought to interpret his rhetorical Expressions according to my seventh Rule, and will make it manifest that he was no Friend to Transubstantiation: For in his *Epist. ad Ceciliam*, his main Argument against those that gave the Eucharist only in Water, is, That

the

the Blood of Christ with which we are Redeem'd and Quickened, cannot seem to be in the Cup when there is no Wine in the Cup, by which the Blood of Christ is represented. And afterwards he says, That contrary to the Evangelical and Apostolical Doctrin, Water was in some Places offered (or given) in the Lord's Cup, which alone cannot express the Blood of Christ. In the same Epistle also, he says, That by Water the People is understood, and by Wine the Blood of Christ is shewed; but when in the Cup Water is mingled with Wine, the People is united to Christ.

§. 24. So that according to St. Cyprian's Argument, Wine in the sacramental Cup is no otherwise changed into Christ's Blood, than the Water mixed with it is changed into the People, who are said to be united to Christ. And I hope T. B. will grant that was not by the way of Transubstantiation.

In the next place, T. B. produces for his

T. B. §. 4. §. 25. (4.) Fourth Witness St. Hilary, a great Champion against the Arians, and I doubt not but to shew without weakening his Argument against the Arians, that he never dreamt of Transubstantiation. To this purpose I will—1. Lay before you the Occasion of the Passages produced.—2. Explain the true Import of them.—3. Answer particularly the Expressions T. B. seems to insist on.—4. Prove by Arguments taken from this Passage. And—5. From other Places of this Author, that he is not to be understood in the Sense of Transubstantiation.

§. 26. 1. The Occasion of this Discourse of St. Hilary, is this, The Orthodox to prove the Consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, producing those Words of the Lord, *I and my Father are one*: The Hereticks to elude their Argument, contend that it was to be understood of a Unity, not of Nature, but of Consent and Will, which they illustrated by three Texts. The first, *Acts 4. 32. The Multitude of them that believed, were of one Heart and one Soul.* To this St. Hilary Answers, *I Ask whether they were not one by Faith? If then all were one by Faith, that is, by the Nature of one Faith, Why should you not understand a natural Unity among them, who were made one by the Nature of one Faith? For all were Born again to Innocence, to Immortality, to the Knowledge of God, to the Hope of Faith; and these Things cannot be diverse, because there is one Hope and one God, as there is one Lord and one Baptism of Regeneration: If these Things are one by Consent only and not by Nature, than pretend that those that are born again to these, were one only by an Unity of Will: But if they were Regenerated into the Nature of one Life and Eternity, by which their Heart and Soul was one, it was not an Unity of Consent only in these who are one, by the Regeneration of the same Nature. For the Apostle teaches us, That this Unity of the Faith-*

Faithful, is from the Nature of the Sacraments. Gal. 3. 27, 28. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.—You are all one in Jesus Christ. What is one in so great a diversity of Nations, Conditions and Sexes? Is it by the Assent of Will, or by the Unity of Sacraments, because they have all one Baptism, and have all put on one Christ? Then he proceeds to the second Text of the Hereticks. 1 Cor. 3. 8. Now he that Planteth and he that Watereth are one. Which he thus Answers. Are they not one because being Born again in one Baptism, there is but one Dispensation of one regenerating Baptism? Do they not do the same Thing? Are they not One in One? Therefore they that are One by One and the same Thing, are One in Nature and not only in Will, because they are both made the same Thing, and are the Ministers of the same Thing and Efficiency. The third Text of the Hereticks he proceeds to, is, Joh. 17. 20, 21. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their Word. That they may all be one as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in me. And in Answer to this from the Example of the Eucharist, he proves, That we have an Unity with Christ, not only of Consent and Will, but of Nature by Eating of it. To which purpose all the Passage produced by T. B. comes in. And from this Account of the Occasion, we may clearly see.

§. 27. 2. *The true Import of this Passage.* And I have these two Reasons to confirm me, That St. Hilary means only a Spiritual, not a Carnal Eating of Christ's Flesh.—1. That the Spiritual fully Answers. And—2. That the Carnal does not Answer his Purpose. His Purpose is to prove our Union with Christ to be more than an Union of Wills, even a real and a natural One; and when in the Sacrament, the Faithful receive Christ's Body Spiritually, and by the Mouth of Faith (as Macarius expresses it) that Act of the Soul is as real as any Act of the Body can be, and consequently renders their Union with Christ more than moral, even a real (however Spiritual and Mystical) Union. On the contrary, a corporal Eating of Christ's Flesh, would by no means Answer his Purpose. For says, Nemesius, They cannot be said to be one Thing, that are only laid together one by or within the other, as Wood and Iron in the same Bundle. And Vasquez determines, That to make of two Things one, it is not enough that those two Things be joyned together by a propinquity in respect of Place or Substance, unless they be also connected some other way. So that supposing a carnal Eating of Christ possible, that without a spiritual Eating of him could not make our Union with him real; which yet is sufficiently effected by the Spiritual without the Corporal. And consequently our Interpretation of St. Hilary, no way invalidates

dates his Argument. This will appear more manifest, when I have

§. 28. 3. Considered and Accounted for the particular Expressions produced by T. B. and the Objections the Romanists hence infer. As——1. He says, *We truly Eat the word made Flesh* (in *cibo dominico*) *in the Meat of our Lord.* How can it be thought, but that Christ is naturally in us. (Here T. B. stops, but Hilary goes on) *who both being born a Man took the Nature of our Flesh inseparably to himself, and also joyned the Nature of our Flesh to the Nature of his Eternity in the Sacrament of his Flesh, to be communicated to us?*

§. 29. I answer,—1. We may truly eat the Word made Flesh, when we eat him Spiritually. For consult St. *Aug. de Civ. Dei.* l. 21. 29. *cum Tract. in Jo.* 26. and you will find, that Truly and Spiritually are not opposites.—2. As Christ is naturally in us by partaking of the Eucharist, so the same St. Hilary says before, that *we put on Christ by the Nature of one Baptism,* and yet none will sure say, that Christ is substantially in the Water of Baptism. He affirms Christians also to be *naturally one, who are united by the Nature of one Faith and one Baptism,* and why may we not as well be naturally one with Christ by Faith, and a spiritual Manducation?

§. 30. Again, St. Hilary says, *There's truly Flesh and truly Blood, and these being Received and Drank, make us to be in Christ and Christ in us.* I Answer, Christ is in us and we in Christ, by Baptism as well as the Eucharist. And such a carnal Conjunction as our Adversaries contend for, would produce no more real Union between us and him, than if Transubstantiation were true, would be between him and Reprobates, nay Rats and Mice, that should devour the sacred Symbols.

§. 31. But St. Hilary, affirms, *That in us being Carnal (or in our Carnal Bodies) we have Christ remaining in us by his Flesh.* So T. B., but it is *per carnem,* by the Flesh, to denote that we are wholly united to Christ both in respect of our Souls and our Bodies: As 1 Cor. 6. 15. St. Paul speaks, *Know ye not that your Bodies are the Members of Christ?* And thus we may be carnally united to Christ, i. e. united to him in respect of our Flesh as well as of our Spirits, by a spiritual Participation. I proceed

§. 32. 4. To propose some Arguments out of this Testimony from St. Hilary, against Transubstantiation. As—1. In Answer to the two first Texts produced by the Hereticks, as the occasion of the Words cited by T. B. he affirms Christians to be *naturally united to one another by Faith and Baptism,* as well as to be natu-

naturally united to Christ by the Eucharist: And as the former is only Mystical and Spiritual, so also is the latter.—2. He says, *We truly take the word being Flesh in the Lord's Meat*, and therefore never believed that the word made Flesh, and this *cibus Dominicus*, were substantially the same. For he plainly distinguishes them, the word *made Flesh* being the thing we take, and the *cibus Dominicus* the thing by which we take it. Otherwise to say, that we take the *Word being Flesh by the Meat of the Lord*, would be all one as to say, we take the word *Flesh by the word Flesh*. Which would be a Tautology unbecoming the Great St. Hilary, of whose Reputation, as a rational Disputant, T. B. seems too Zealous to allow any such Weakness.—3. St. Hilary affirms us to be *naturally in Christ as well as Christ in us*. As then our being in Christ is not an existing in him as in a Place, so neither is Christ so *locally* in us, but only *Spiritually* and *Mystically*. In a word, he speaks of such an Eating of Christ, and of such an Existence of Christ in us, as without which no Body can be in him; whence I infer, that he means a spiritual and not a corporal Eating; since otherwise neither the Fathers before Christ, nor Infants or other faithful Christians dying without the Eucharist, ever were or ever will be in Christ.

§. 33. 5. It only remains that I prove by some other Testimonies of St. Hilary, that he had no notion of a Transubstantiation, nor ever dreamt that Christ's Flesh was properly in the Stomach of every Communicant in a carnal Sense. For in this very Book *Hil. l. 8. de* a little after he hath these Words. *A Man or any other Being like Trinit.* him (i. e. a corporal Substance) when he is (alicubi) in one Place, he cannot be (alibi) in another. Which sure is inconsistent with the Transubstantiator's Opinion of Christ's Body being in many Places at once. Again he says, *The Lord says, Behold I am with* *Id. in Psal.* you always to the end of the World. *For he is with them present by his* 124. *Nature, when he is faithfully Invoked; for his Spirit penetrates and contains all Things. For he is not bodily with us, so that when he is in one Place he should be absent from another; but by his Spirit that is every where, he is always present with him that believes.* Which is not to talk like a Papist, who sticks not to assert Christ to be bodily present in many distant Places at once. The same Father speaking of Judas, as absent at the celebration of the Eucharist; he says, *He was not worthy of the Communion of the Eternal Sacraments,* *Id. Coment. in* *Mass. can. 30.* *for his return at the Head of the Multitude, afterwards shews that he was gone away.* Nor indeed could he Drink with him, who was not to Drink with him in his Kingdom, when he promised all then Drinking of the Fruit of the Vine, to Drink with him afterwards. I hope

T. B. will have such a concern for the Honour of this great Champion of the Faith, as to grant he never meant Transubstantiation in l. 8. *de Trinit.* that he may be found always speaking consistent with himself.

T. B. §. 5. §. 34. (5. T. B's next Witness, is St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and (as Bellarmine before him) glories in it as if it were unanswerable, tho' he will find nothing in it for his purpose, when particularly and closely Examined.

§. 35. 1. Is this then a Proof of Transubstantiation, *Christ himself saying of Bread, this is my Body, whoever after dares question it? And the same affirming of Wine, this is my Blood, who will call it in doubt, and say it is not his Blood?* Not we Protestants sure T. B. knows. If he reads our Liturgy he finds we deliver the Elements to the Communicants, under the Name of the *Body and Blood* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and so we believe it to be: Only with St. Augustine's Limitation, Ep. 23. That the Sacrament of the Body of Christ (*secundum quendam modum*) after a certain manner is the *Body of Christ*.

§. 36. 2. But St. Cyrill (may T. B. urge) illustrates this change in the Eucharist, by a miraculous and substantial Change of Water into Wine at Cana. And shall he be unworthy to gain our Belief, that he changed Wine into his Blood? If being invited to a corporeal Marriage, he wrought an astonishing Miracle; ought we not for much greater Reason, acknowledge that he hath given his Body and Blood to the Children of the Spouse? It is in the Greek, τῷ νυμφῶνι. The Bride Chamber. But Sclater in his *Consensus Veterum*, and other *Papists* translates it *Spouse*, and T. B. to let us see he never consults the Original, propagates and improves the Blunder and presents us here with an *He-Spouse* of Christ: Which to us Protestants seems a great Blunder, tho' *Papists* perhaps can with their Transubstantiation easily swallow much greater. To make it appear how little this makes for Transubstantiation, let these Things be considered,

§. 37. 1. That whoever speaks of the change of one thing into another, tho' both be substances, he does not always mean a substantial Change. For instance, Origen speaks of the *Saints changed into Angels*: Chrysostome of *Mens being changed into Beasts*: Macarius of *Saints, after the Resurrection, transmuted into the Divine Nature*: Gregory Nyssen of *Christ's Flesh being changed into the Divinity*: And Cæsarius of *God at the Incarnation changed into Man*. Yet all these meant only an accidental Change, tho' they speak of Substances changed into one another; and consequently the change of *Wine into Blood*, may be no substantial, but an accidental Change. And

§. 38. 2. The comparing of it to a miraculous substantial Change does not necessarily prove this to be a Change of the same kind. This same St. Cyrill *Catech. illumin. 2.* says of our Regeneration, *He that rais'd Lazarus after four Days, cannot he, O Man, much more easily raise thee that art Breathing and Alive?* And in his 4th, *Moses Rod was chang'd into the different Nature of a Serpent by the Divine Will, and may not Man laps'd into Death be again brought to himself?* Can any Man reasonably argue hence that our Regeneration is a Change of the same kind with the Resurrection of a dead Man, or the turning of a Rod into a Serpent? Nay, St. *Augustine* illustrates the accidental change of our Bodies at the Resurrection by this substantial Change of Water into Wine. *He that was able to change Water into Wine, is able to change Grass into Gold, and of Flesh to make an Angel.* Will any one hence infer a Transubstantiation of our Flesh into an Angel, because it is illustrated by that substantial Change of Water into Wine? And why then may not Cyrill compare a Sacramental Change to a Substantial? Especially if it be considered—1. That this Change in the Sacrament is not the same as that at *Cana*, for then it would be a sensible Change, as that was. We doubt not, but that God can change the Substance of one Body into the Substance of another, as he did Water into Wine, which was a true and proper Transubstantiation. But will *T. B.* say, That there is such a Change as this in the Eucharist? If so, the substance of Bread must be changed into another substance, that was not existing before, as that numerical Wine into which the Water was chang'd had no Existence before that Change. But sure Christ's Body at this Sacramental Change is not created a-new, which hath existed above 1700. Years from the Incarnation. And tho' he that created all Things, can of Water, or any other Substance make Wine, or any other new Substance; yet that he can make Christ's Body, which is already a compleat Substance, of Bread or any other Substance, is an Absurdity that does not follow. If you explain the Matter by the Addition of Christ's Body into the room of the Substance of the Bread, you destroy Transubstantiation, unless as oft as one Man succeeds into the room of another that is gone, you will say he is transubstantiated into him. But to put this Matter past Dispute, let it be consider'd—2. That St. Cyrill means here only a *Sacramental*, and not a *Real* Change, which I prove by these Arguments.

§. 39. *Arg. 1.* In his following Catechesis, giving an Account of the Change of this Bread and Wine, he says, *We pray the God of Mercy, that he will send his Spirit on the Things set before*

us, and make the Bread the Body, and the Wine the Blood of Christ: For whatsoever the Holy Spirit once touches, it is sanctified and changed. Now this were not true, if he meant it of a substantial Change. For then Water in Baptism, and Oyl in the Chrism, would be substantially changed since the Holy Spirit touches them, as he teaches *Catech. illumin. 3. and Mystag. 3.*

§. 40. Arg. 2. He says in *Catech. 1. As the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist before the Holy Invocation is simple Bread and Wine, but after Invocation the Bread is the Body, and the Wine the Blood of Christ; After the very same manner (ἡ αὐτὴν δὲ τεύξον) the Meat of satanical Pomp in their own Nature being simple (or pure) Food, by the Invocation of Demons become impure.* Now these are made impure only by a change of Qualities and Condition, and not of Substance; and consequently the change in the Sacrament he understood to be no other.

Lastly, St. Cyrill, in the Passage under Debate by those Words, *Much more ought we not to acknowledge, &c.* plainly declares, That he concludes the less from the greater; and that the change of Wine into Christ's Blood being inferiour to the change of Water into Wine at *Cana*, he that believes *this*, ought much more not to question *that*; nor to wonder if he that changed Water into Wine substantially and sensibly, changes Wine into Christ's Blood Sacramentally.

§. 41. 3. But to proceed with the rest of St. Cyrill's Testimony, which translated from the Greek exactly, is thus, *Wherefore let us receive them with all full assurance, As the Body and Blood of Christ. For in the Type of Bread is given to thee the Body, and in the Type of Wine is given to thee the Blood, that partaking the Body and Blood of Christ thou may'st become Con-corporeal (σύνωμος) and (σύναιμος) Consanguineal with him.* For so we become (χρησποῖροι) bearers of Christ, his Body and Blood being received into our Members. Whence observe,

§. 42. 1. It is in the Original, *Let us receive them (viz. Bread and Wine) as the Body and Blood of Christ:* Whereas T. B. (as others of his way before him) Translates it, *Let us receive the Body and Blood of Christ*, that it may seem a little more to favour their Cause.

§. 43. 2. *In the Type of Bread is given to thee the Body, &c.* I observe T. B. somewhat more Ingenuous in Translating it *Type*, than others of his way that render it *Species*, in the Sense of the present Church of Rome (tho' unknown to the Ancients) for the bare Appearance and Accidents. But if he would have us to understand *Type* in that Sense, he must Excuse us. For Cyrill by the *Type of Bread means Bread which is a Type*, and in the *Type of Wine,*

Wine, Wine which is a Type. As in St. Paul, the Sign of Circumcision, for Circumcision which is a Sign. Giving a Reason here, why in the preceding Period he calls the Elements Christ's Body and Blood, because Types are after a sort the Thing typified. In *Catech. Mystag.* 5. the same St. Cyrill calls the Bread and Wine *Antitypes of Christ's Body and Blood*, which implies them to be distinct Substances as the Antitype and Architype must be. Compare this Passage with a like one in the other Cyrill of *Alexand.* when speaking of Christ, he says, *Christ is the true Manna, who was given to the Ancients by God the Father in the Type of Manna.* Not I hope in the Accidents and Appearance of *Manna*. Christ's Body may be given to us under the Type of Bread in a Spiritual and Sacramental Sense without any Transubstantiation, as he was given to the *Israelites* under the Type of *Manna*.

§. 44. 3. We believe with *Cyrill*, That the Faithful by this Typical Body and Blood of Christ become of one Body and one Blood with Christ. For the Sacrament is not an empty, but an effectual Sign of the Thing signified: And as in Baptism, so in the Eucharist (as I have shewed from St. Hilary) we are one with Christ, and yet there is no Transubstantiation. According to that known Saying of *Leo*, concerning the Person Baptized, *Leo de pass. Being receiv'd by Christ, and receiving Christ, he is not the same after as before his Baptism, but the Body of the Regenerated is the pus regeniti* *Serm. 14. Cor- est caro cruci-*
Flesh of him that was Crucified. And if this could be said without a Transubstantiation in Baptism, I am sure what *Cyrill* here says, can prove no such Thing in the Eucharist. And *fixi-*

§. 45. 4. When T. B. hath been told, That *Athanasius* calls the Catholicks *Christophori*, because they taught better of Christ, than the *Arians*, and that other Fathers style Virgins *Christophore*, because they bear in their Bodies a Symbole of Christ's Purity: That the Author of the *Dialogues* ascribed falsely to *Cassarius*, the Brother of *Nazianzen*, says, Of all that are Baptized into, and have put on Christ, *That they are the Congregation of the Church bearing Christ*, and that this same St. Cyrill in *Procatech.* says, *Then you will enjoy the Waters having a Christ-bearing Fragrancy, then you will receive the Appellation of Christ, and the Virtue of Divine Things*: When, I say, T. B. hath reflected on these Passages, he will allow us to be *Christophori*, without Transubstantiation.

§. 46. So that hitherto nothing is found in St. Cyrill's Catechism, but what better agrees with the Sentiments of a Protestant Minister, than a Popish Priest. But perhaps T. B. expects better Service from the last Clause he cites, *Do not therefore think of*

Cyr. Cat. My-
tag. 3.

of mere Bread and Wine, &c. I answer, The same is said by the same Father of Chrism, and with relation to the Eucharist too. See you, think not this a mere Unguent. For as the Bread in the Eucharist after the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer bare Bread, but the Body of Christ; so also this Holy Oyntment is no longer bare or common Oyntment after Invocation, but a Gift (*χρησµα*) of Christ and the Holy Spirit, being effectual through the Presence of his Divine Nature. Hence it is plain, That he no more thought of a substantial Change in the Eucharist, than in the Oyntment, but as the Oyntment remains Oyntment after Consecration, tho' no longer mere Oyntment; so the Bread and Wine remain to be Bread and Wine after Consecration, tho' no longer mere Bread

Cyr. Catech. il-
lumin. 3.

and Wine. The same St. Cyrill says of Baptism, Look not on it as mere Water. And yet sure it is Water still. Tho' therefore afterwards in this fourth Catech. Mystagog. he saith, The Bread which is seen is not Bread, his meaning must be, it is not mere Bread. And Cardinal Parrone's Observation will justify that Interpretation, That it is usual for the greater Emphasis sake to express the Affirmation or Denial of some Qualities by the Affirmation or Denial of the Substances themselves. As in that of St. Ambrose, *Ego non sum Ego*, and that of the Apostles, *That which thou sowest is not that Body that shall be*. Where tho' the Substance seem to be denied, yet only some Quality is understood.

1 Cor. 15. 37.

§. 47. But St. Cyrill adds, and it is the last cited by T. B. and by reminding me oft of it, he seems to depend very much on it. Altho' Sense suggest this to you, judge not by your last, but hold with an assured Faith, &c. That they are the Body and Blood of Christ that are given you. To this I answer, That he doth not here require us simply to Dis-believe our Senses, but Cautions us to believe further than our Senses can penetrate. For what he says is not to be understood of the Elements themselves, but of the Mystical and Sacramental Nature of them. St. Chrysostome says as much of Baptism, *Let us believe the Affirmation of God, for it is more certain than our Sight, for our Sight often fails, but its impossible that should fail*. The like I could produce out of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, and yet those Fathers never dreamed, that the Water in Baptism was substantially changed. And therefore according to my third Rule this Passage cannot favour Transubstantiation: Nor require us to Dis-believe our Senses, as to what is sensible in the Eucharist, (which Tertullian requires us expressly to give Credit to) but to believe further than they can inform us. Our Senses judge it to be no more than common Bread, we must believe their Testimony that it is Bread, and further believe God's Word, that it is in its Sacramental Nature (which

Chryst. Hom.
24. in Joan.

Tertul. de ani-
ma. c. 7.

(which is no Object of Sense) the Body of Christ. St. Chrysostome in hom. 7. on 1 Cor. excellently explains himself and St. Cyrill, of which I shall say more, as also of this Argument, when I come to consider T. B's. Allegation out of St. Chrysostome.

§. 48. And now, if T. B. will be ingenuous, he must allow that St. Cyrill's Catechism agrees much better with the Sentiments of a Protestant Minister than a Popish Priest, for we hold not a change of Bread into Christ's Body impossible, but a substantial Change only, which St. Cyrill never imagined. We do not deny Christ's Body Sacramentally and Spiritually to be united to our Bodies, tho' in the gross Sense of Transubstantiation we think it unworthy Christ's glorified Body, and so would St. Cyrill, if such a monstrous Doctrin had been started in his Time. We teach that we are always to believe our Senses in sensible Matters, and St. Cyrill bids us not to dis-believe them, but not to judge wholly by them, which agrees very well with us, who believe our Senses that it is Bread, and believe the Word of Christ too, that it is not meer Bread, but the Body of Christ. This is therefore I say a Catechism, that agrees better with the Catechism of our Church, than T. B's. who on this occasion hath clapt his Wings before the Victory.

§. 49. (6.) His next Witness is St. Basil, concerning which I T. B. §. 6. shall only make these few Remarks.

1. Whether T. B. can justify the Translation of *ισπαρτέον* by offering in Sacrifice.

§. 50. 2. I see not why Christ's Symbolical Body ought not to be accounted more Excellent, than Bulls, Rams, or the Temple. And why the Eucharist on that account may not be thought to exceed legal Sacrifices, tho' there be no Transubstantiation. Especially since Greg. Nazian. says of Baptism (wherein yet there is no Transubstantiation pretended) that those Waters are purer than the Blood of legal Sacrifices, and more Holy than the Ashes of an Heifer. And St. Basil himself says, There is as great a difference between legal Washing, and our Baptism, as between Dreams, Shadows and Images, and the substantial Truth: And that Baptism hath an incomparable Excellency and Exuberancy of Glory. Whence I infer that the Excellency of the Gospel Sacraments consists not in the Substance of the Sacraments, but in the abundance of their Glory and Virtue. For as St. Augustine, contra Faust. l. 19. c. 13. says, Our Sacraments are greater in their Virtue.

§. 51. 3. St. Basil calling the Elements *Antitypes* in his Liturgy, supposes them not to be the same with the *Architype*, and consequently not substantially changed into it, which I shall vindicate

dicare against T. B's. Evasions, in my Reply to his pretended Answer to my first Paper.

T. B. §. 7.

§. 52. (7.) St. Gregory Nyssen, is T. B's. next Witness. And he closes up his confused Hints out of him with this Exultation. *Can any Roman Catholick say more?*

Yes, Sir, a Roman Catholick would say, That the Substance of the Bread and Wine is annihilated, and only the bare Accidents remaining, the Substance of Christ's Body is under them. Now shew me where St. Gregory speaks a word of Accidents subsisting without their Substance? If you cannot, a Roman Catholick can say more, than he doth.

§. 53. This Passage of Gregory is obscure, and shews him to be a Man of Fancy: But attend to the Design of it, and it will appear to make nothing for Transubstantiation. His Notion is this, That as our Bodies by Eating became subject to Corruption, so by Eating they became capable of Immortality; which must be, he says, by receiving an immortal Body into our Bodies, such as the Body of Christ was. But how, says he, could that immortal Body, which is to remain whole in it self, be distributed to all the Faithful over all the World? He answers, That our Bodies do consist of Bread and Wine which are their proper Nourishment, and Christ's Body being like ours, that did so too, which by the Union with the Word of God was chang'd into a Divine Dignity. Then he adds, So I believe the sanctified Bread by the Power of the Word of God to be chang'd into the Body of God the Word. Hence I infer, That if there were no change of Substances in the Incarnation of the Word, there is none in the Sanctification of the Bread, which is chang'd into the Body of God the Word, after the same manner that Christ's Body was chang'd into a Divine Dignity, which was not by Transubstantiation, but by a Presence of the λόγος or Word, so that according to my fourth Rule, this can be no Proof of Transubstantiation. That this was his Meaning is manifest from what follows. For, says he, that Body (to which he was Incarnate) was sanctify'd by the Habitation of the Word, dwelling in Flesh, therefore as the Bread was then chang'd into a Divine Dignity in the Body, so it is now: And the Bread is chang'd into the Body of the Word (λόγος not of Jesus Christ,) as it was said by the Word, this is my Body. And so by receiving this Divine Body into our Bodies, they are made capable of Immortality. So that this Discourse proves rather the λόγος, or Word to be impanated, than the Bread to be transubstantiated.

§. 54. From this obscure Passage let us appeal to a more clear Discourse of the same St. Gregory, Orat. de S. Baptismo, where he says,

says, That as an Altar is by Nature a common Stone, but consecrated to the Worship of God is an Holy Table, and an immaculate Altar; and as the Bread of the Eucharist at first is common Bread, but so soon as the Mystery hath sanctify'd it, is both called, and is the Body of Christ, and operates excellently (which by the way shews that he means it is Christ's Body, not substantially but virtually, and in its excellent Use and sacramental Operation) As also (as he goes on) the Priest, yesterday a common Man, by a new Benediction is become a Teacher of Piety, a Dispenser of Mysteries, and not at all chang'd in Body and Form, by a certain invisible Power and Grace hath his Soul chang'd for the better: So in like manner Water, being nothing else but Water, by the Heavenly Grace, Blessing it, renews a Man into that Regeneration, which is perceiv'd in the Mind. Hence I infer by my first Rule, that there is no more Transubstantiation in the Eucharist, than in the Consecration of an Altar, the Ordination of a Priest, or the Water of Baptism, and consequently that Greg. Nyss. never thought of a substantial Change in the Bread of the Eucharist, which he sorts with those other Changes that cannot be substantial.

§. 55. I may add, That the Notion of St. Gregory, which is in the first Passage, and seems rather to prove (if it prove any thing) an Impanation of the λόγος, than any Transubstantiation, is a Notion peculiar to himself, a new Fancy of his own, and propos'd by him with a deal of Modesty, not as very solid, but only as somewhat probable. Perhaps, says he, we are not far from Probability.

If T. B. urge the Word Transselementation, it hath been observ'd by a Great Man, that it is us'd by this Father in nineteen Places besides this (some are mention'd in the Margent) and in all the rest apply'd to a Change only of Qualities or Use, and not of Substance. A Transselementation only denotes a Change of the Elements, a Translation of them from the Condition of common Elements into that of a Sacrament, and Antitypes of Christ's Body and Blood. And since this is all St. Gregory says, if a Romanist would be content to say no more, we Protestants should agree with them well enough, as we do with him, and all the Fathers hitherto produc'd.

§. 56. 8. St. Chrysostome is T. B's. next Witness. Concerning whose Pathetick and Rhetorical way of Writing, especially in his Homilies I have something to Premise; that he with some others of great Eloquence, making it their Business to increase the People's Devotions, and awaken them to great Preparations for receiving the Eucharist (for going to hear Mass was so far from being any part of their Devotion, that all were com-

Greg. Nyss. 1.
2. contra Eum.
nom. Hom. 1.
de resur. Ep. ad
Eustarb. Lat.
& Ambros.

T. B. §. 8.

manded to depart that did not Communicate) employ'd all the force of their Oratory to raise so much Reverence, that the contemptible Elements of *Bread and Wine* might not bring a cheapness and disesteem on those Holy Mysteries. No wonder then, if in their Sermons and devout Meditations they run out into some Expressions, that may need to be mollify'd with Allowances commonly given to Panegyricks and Perswasives. Especially St. Chrysostome, who (as one well observes) *on all Occasions is wont to rise high in his Figures, and expatiate on all Subjects in all the delightful Varieties of a fertile Fancy.* And no wonder if he on so great a Subject use some Excesses in his Style, and display all the Beauties of that ravishing Art, in which he was so great a Master. So that reasonable Allowances are to be made him in this Case; and if any Phrases taken Grammatically look hideous, they ought in Reason to be consider'd as Figures.

§. 57. This Premis'd, I shall consider all that T. B. produces out of St. Chrysostome distinctly and particularly.

He begins with *Hom. 84. in Matt.* so T. B. cites it, and thereby shews how much he is a Stranger to this Fathers Writings. For in the *Latin* Version it is the 83d, and in the *Greek* the 82d *Homily*, wherein the Passage cited by him is found.

The Words are, *Let us in all Things believe God, and not contradict him, tho' what he says seems contrary to our Thoughts and Eyes. But let his Word be of more Authority with us, than Reason and Sight. And so let us do in the Mysteries, not looking only on what lies before us, but let us hold fast his Words. For his Word cannot deceive us, but our Sense is easily deceiv'd, that never Errs, but this is commonly mistaken. Since then his Word says, this is my Body, let us be perswaded of it, and believe it, and behold it with our intellectual Eyes.* Here T. B. breaks off with a great deal of Disingenuity, if not in him, at least in the Author from whom he Transcribes; since what immediately follows is a sufficient Answer to what Transubstantiators can pretend from this Place. For thus the Father proceeds, *For Christ hath deliver'd to us nothing sensible, but under sensible Things all Things intelligible. For so also in Baptism, under Water, which is a sensible Thing is the Gift, but that is intelligible which is perform'd there, our Regeneration and Renovation. For if you were incorporeal, he would have deliver'd to you the Gifts naked and incorporeal: But because thy Soul is joyn'd to thy Body, intelligible (or spiritual) Things are deliver'd to thee under sensible.*

§. 58. And why, Sir, was this Passage left out? Because it was not for your Purpose, as clearly shewing that the Father gives.

gives the same caution with respect to Baptism, as to the Eucharist. He cautions us to trust our Senses no more in any of the Mysteries, than in that one. What then did he mean, that I must not believe my Eyes that in Baptism the thing sensible is Water? If not, then he never meant, that in the Eucharist I must not believe my Eyes, that the thing sensible is Bread. All he means is, that we must believe farther than we can see, that an inward and spiritual Grace lies under, and is communicated by the outward and visible Sign. So that he does not reject the Testimony of our Senses in the Eucharist, but that we are not to judge of the Spiritual Grace and Virtue of the Mysteries by our bodily Senses. To make this more clear, the same St. Chrysostome says, *The Poor when we bestow on them, let us be affected as if we gave to Christ, for his Words are more certain than our Sight. Therefore when you see a poor Man, remember his Words, by which he signifies, that it is he himself whom you Feed: For tho' what is seen is not Christ, yet in this Figure he Asks and Receives.* Did St. Chrysostome here intend that I should not believe my Eyes, that the poor Man is a Man? Or only that I should believe beyond what I see? And if I may believe my Eyes, that the poor Man is not transubstantiated into Christ; I may credit them when they give me the same assurance, that the Bread is not transubstantiated in the Eucharist; and the one is no more inconsistent with this Father's Sentiments, than the other. But to put it out of doubt what St. Chrysostome means, I desire T. B. to read his seventh Homily on the former Epistle to the Corinthians, out of which I will transcribe a little for his Conviction.

Chrys. Hom.
89. in Man.

Chrys. Edit.
Comel. 1603.
P. 378.

In Mysteries, says he, we see one thing and believe another, and about them I am affected one way and an Infidel another. He hearing of the Laver, thinks it is only Water, but I behold not only that which is seen, but the cleansing of the Soul by the Spirit; he thinks that only my Body is Washed, but I believe my Soul also is made Clean and Holy.—— For I judge not by the Sight but by the Eyes of the Mind. And then he adds, I hear of the Body of Christ, and I understand what is said one way and an Infidel another. And as Children beholding Books, know not the Powers of Letters, nor understand what they see, — whilst one that can read will find a great Power in Letters, and whole Lives and Histories described in them. If an unskilful Man receive an Epistle, it is to him bare Ink and Paper, but the skilful hears Words, Discourses with the Absent, and says to them what they have a Mind. So is it in the Mystery. And can any thing now be more plain, than what St. Chrysostome means by believing God, tho' what he says seems contrary to our Reason and Eyes? viz. That we must without disbelieving what we see, believe

believe more than we see. And since he says the same of Baptism and Letters as of the Eucharist, he intended to discountenance our Senses no more in this, than in those Instances. So that I hope T. B. will have so much Ingenuity, as to insist no more on the Authority of St. Cyrill and St. Chrysostome to discredit the Testimony of our Senses. To proceed with T. B's Testimony.

St. Chrysostome goes on thus, *How many now say, O that I might see his Form, his Shape, his Cloaths, his Shoes? Behold thou Sees him, thou Touches him, thou Eats him: Thou but desires to see his Cloaths, and he gives himself to thee not only to See him, but to Touch him, to Eat him, and to Receive him even within thee.*

§. 59. And does this favour the Doctrin of the Church of Rome, who teaches expressly, that in the Eucharist Christ is not seen nor touched? By my sixth Rule then this cannot be reasonably urged for Transubstantiation. As also what is said in the preceding Passage, that in the Sacrament *Christ hath delivered to us nothing sensible.* For according to your Trent Catechism, a Sacrament is *res sensibus subjecta*, a thing sensible: So that if nothing sensible were delivered, there would be no Sacrament, and therefore that is not grammatically true.

Hom. 50. in
Matt.

§. 60. Here then St. Chrysostome's meaning is, that we see and touch Christ, as we see and touch this Sacrament of him; just as he says, *We hear Christ speaking when we hear his Gospel.* Origen says, *He that sees the Image of any one, sees him, of whom it is the Image:* And Eusebius, Greg. Nyssen and Theodoret, say, *The Archetype is beheld in the Image.* Paulinus says, *You shall see Christ in every poor Man, and touch him in every indigent Person.* And it is a known Passage of St. Augustine, *Saul raged on Earth and touched Christ in Heaven:* When he persecuted him in his Members. It is common with St. Chrysostome, and many others of the Ancients to say, That Christ himself is seen, touched, entertained and fed in the Poor, who are his Image and Representations. And why may he not as well be said to be seen, touched, eaten and received within us in the Eucharist without Transubstantiation, since he is not transubstantiated into the Poor. And Damascen speaking of the Cross, says, *Wherever the sign of Christ is, there is Christ himself.*

§. 61. To proceed then with St. Chrysostome. *Its not enough for him to be made Man, to be Scourged with Whips, to be put to Death for us, unless he also mix himself with us and make us his Body, not only by Faith, but in very Deed. Than, what then, ought not he to be more pure that enjoys this Sacrifice? What Ray of the Sun, &c. Contemplate with what an Honour thou art honoured? What a Table thou*

thou enjoys? We are Nourished with that which the Angels see with Trembling, and cannot stedfastly behold without being dazzled with its Splendor; with this we are reduc'd into one Mass, and are made Christ's Body and one Flesh.

§. 62. On this Passage hear what your great School-Man Suarez ^{Suarez in 3} says. Observing St. Chrysostome says, Christ mixes himself with us, ^{Thom. disp. 64.} and that many Divines took it literally and simply, he adds, ^{S. 3.} This Opinion seems improbable to many Divines, and unbecoming the Dignity and Majesty of this Sacrament, which was instituted not for our corporal but spiritual Union. And after many Arguments concludes at length, that this Union is not Corporal but Spiritual only, and Mystical.

§. 63. And that Suarez is here in the right, compare with this Passage what the same St. Chrysostome says of Baptism (*Hom. 6. in Colos.*) where speaking to him that was to be Baptized, he says, *You will just now embrace the Lord himself, thou wilt be mixed with his Body, that Body which is above, whither the Devil cannot approach.* May I not as well infer a corporal Union in Baptism from this Passage, as a corporal Union in the Eucharist from that? Christ then mixes himself with us in the same sense as he says here, he makes us his Body not only by Faith but in very Deed and Reality, yet in a spiritual and mystical Sense, that even when every actual Operation of the Mind ceases, we are habitually his true Members and Flesh.

§. 64. Besides, can it be literally true that any Tongue is purpled in the Blood of Christ? Or if he will strain this to the pitch of Transubstantiation in the Eucharist, may not we conclude the same in Baptism from Tertullian, when he says, *That therein we are dyed in the Passion of the Lord.* ^{Tertul. de Baptismo.}

St. Chrysostome goes on thus, *Who can speak the Noble Acts of the Lord, or make all his Praises to be heard? What Shepherd feeds his Sheep with his own Limbs? Why say I Shepherd? There are Mothers oft, that deliver their Children to other Nurses: This he will not do, but nourishes us with his own Blood, and in all Things unites himself to us.* We grant all that this Comparison imports, that Christ nourishes us with his own Flesh and Blood, not only in the Eucharist but in his other Institutions. *There is,* says St. Basil, *an intellectual Mouth of the inward Man, by which he is Nourished that receives the Word of Life, which is the Bread that came down from Heaven.* ^{Basil. in Ps. 33.} And St. Chrysostome himself says, *Christ gives himself to us for spiritual Food and Meat.* ^{Chrys. Hom. 26. in Matt. Aug. de util. pennis.} And St. Augustine tells us, *That is spiritual Meat, which is received by Faith, not that which is taken by the Body.* And that St. Chrysostome so means, it is manifest from what he adds, a little after the last Passage cited by T. B.

and

and before the next comes in, which he hath warily left out as not for his purpose. *Why do not all, says he, get good by this? It is their own Fault, who do not receive him: For to all the Faithful he unites himself by this Mystery.* Did he think of Transubstantiation, when he affirms that the Wicked receive not Christ, tho' they receive the Elements? Which therefore are not turned into the substance of Christ.

§. 65. And now I am come to the last Clause of this Testimony, out of the Homily on St. *Matthem.* The Words are, *The Things before us are not the Works of human Power. He that did those Things in that Supper, the same operates now the same Things. We hold the Place of Ministers, but it is he himself that Sanctifies and Changes them.* And just as much doth St. Chrysostome say of Baptism. *The Spirit hath the chief part, it is not an Angel that moves the Waters, but the Lord of Angels who operates all Things. And unless there be a Transubstantiation also in Baptism, this Expression can imply none here, but by my first Rule, must be concluded Impertinent to T. B's purpose.*

T. B. §. 9.

§. 66. St. Chrysostome Hom. 24. in 1 Cor. says, *He Speaks very truly and terribly: And this is what he says, That which is in the Chalice, is that which flowed from the Side, and this is that we are Partakers of.* The Question here, is, Whether he meant these Words *Sacramentally* only or *Literally*; and I leave it to any impartial Man to judge, when he hath considered—
1. What St. Gregory Nyssen says of Christ, *He is the true Bunch of Grapes which the Israelite-Spies brought out of Canaan.*—
2. What Tertullian de Bapt. says, *This is that Water, which flowed to the People from the Rock that followed them.*—3. What St. Ambrose by an Apostrophe, says of the Water of Baptism, *Thee, when thou burst from our Saviour's side, they saw that smote him.*—4. What Isidore says of the same Water, *It is the Water which at the time of the Passion flowed from Christ's side.* And—

Chrys. Hom.

84. in Joan.

id. Hom. ad

Neophyt.

5. What St. Chrysostome himself says, *As oft as thou approaches to the dreadful Cup, thou comes to Drink (as) as it were out of Christ's side.* Which is a mollifying Expression. And elsewhere, *Baptism and the Mysteries, which seem to be drawn out of Christ's side.* For certainly T. B. must make a many Transubstantiations, if such a Phrase as this must pass for a good Proof of it.

§. 67. But St. Chrysostome saith further, *What is most precious in Heaven, you may see on Earth, and not only see it, but touch it, but eat it, but return Home with it.* And does T. B. indeed understand all this *Literally*? Is the substantial Change then become Visible and Palpable? A new Discovery even to

Tran-

Transubstantiators themselves. What thinks T. B. of *Theodoret*, when he says. *That the Words of the Apostles shew Christ an Infant wrapt in his swaddling Cloaths?* Must these Words be taken Literally too? If not, what reason that those of *St. Chrysostome* should? But *St. Chrysostome* says here, *We see an Earth that which is most Honourable in Heaven; The Body of the King.* And this T. B. thinks enough to justify all their Contradictions and Absurdities, in affirming Christ's Body to be in Heaven, and on Earth in a thousand Places at the same time. But let him consider, that in the same Sense that *St. Chrysostome* here affirms Christ to be seen and touched, in the very same sense doth he mean him to be present on Earth. Now he is not seen but in the Sign, nor therefore is he otherwise present. Its well known what *St. Augustine* teaches in this Matter, *That as to his carnal Presence, Christ said truly to his Disciples, Me ye have not always. The Church enjoy'd his carnal Presence but a few Days; still she possesses him by Faith, tho' she see him not with her Eyes.* And that saying of *Vigilius* or *Gelasius* makes it more clear: *Whilst Christ was on Earth he was not in Heaven: And now because he is in Heaven he is no longer on Earth, i. e. unless Spiritually and Virtually in the Efficacy of his Sacraments.*

§. 68. Thus have I examin'd all T. B. produces out of *St. Chrysostome*, except the last out of *L. 3. de Sacerdotio*, which because it chiefly relates to what I argue in my first Paper against Transubstantiation about *Miracles*, I will reserve it till I come to consider T. B's Answer to that Paragraph.

§. 69. To conclude then with *St. Chrysostome*, we appeal from all his Rhetorical Flights in his Homilies, to his plain Determination in his Epistle to *Casarius*, cited at large in my former Paper: And I shall close all with a Passage out of the *Imperfect Work on St. Matthew*, which tho' not *St. Chrysostome's* is an Author oft quoted by the *Romish Doctors*, and in great Credit among them. He says, *If it be so dangerous a Matter to transfer into private Uses, those Holy Vessels in which the true Body of Christ is not, but the Mystery of his Body is contained; how much more for the Vessels of our Body, which God hath prepared for himself to dwell in, ought we not to give way to the Devil to do in them what he pleaseth?* This is such an Home-blow against the substantial Change, that our Learned *Usher* observes, the *Papists* have left it out in three several Editions, one at *Antwerp 1537.* another at *Paris 1543.* and another at *Paris again 1557.* tho' it be Extant in the ancienter Editions, one whereof is as Old as the Year 1487.

Chrys. Opus Imperf. in Matt. Vol. 7 Edit. Comel. 1617. p. 310.

B. Ush. Jesuit's Chall. p. 15.

Ambr. de iis
qui Myſteriis
init. c. 9.

T. B. §. 10.

§. 70. (9. T. B's ninth Witness is St. Ambrose. A very large Citation he brings and yet very defective; a deal being left out, which would help to interpret what he produces. So that I must be constrained to transcribe the Passage fully, and then make some Remarks upon it.

Consider with your Selves, says he, whether is more Excellent, the Bread of Angels, or the Flesh of Christ, which surely is the Body of Life? That was from Heaven, this surpasses Heaven. That was subject to Corruption if kept a Day above the time, this so Incorruptible, that whoever religiously Tasts it, becomes exempt from Corruption. Water issued out of a Rock for them, Blood issues out of Christ for you. Those things happened to them in figure of what was to be fulfilled in us. Can know whether's better. Light is better than the Shadow, Truth than the Figure, the Body of the Creator than Heavenly Manna. Perhaps you'll say, I see another Thing; How can you tell me it is the Body of Christ which I receive? This therefore remains for me to prove. And how many Examples do we make use of to prove that it is not what Nature formed; but what the Benediction Consecrated, and that the Power of the Benediction is greater than that of Nature, because Nature it self is changed by the Benediction? Moses held a Rod in his Hand: He threw down the Rod and it was made a Serpent. Again, he took hold of the Tail of the Serpent, and it returned into the Nature of a Rod. You see then that by prophetick Grace Nature was twice changed, the Serpent's Nature and the Rod's. The Rivers of Egypt ran clear Streams of Water: Immediately Blood burst out of the Veins of their Fountains. There was no Drink in their Rivers, and again at the Prophet's Prayers, the Blood of the Rivers ceased, and the Nature of the Waters returned.

§. 71. Here T. B. (as other Popish Authors are wont to do) breaks off, but St. Ambrose proceeds thus.

The Hebrews were surrounded on every side, on one Hand hemmed in by the Egyptians, on the other Hand shut up by the Sea. Moses lifted up the Rod, the Water divided, congealed into the appearance of Walls, and a Way on dry Land appeared between the Waves. Jordan being driven backward, contrary to Nature returns toward its Fountain-head. Is it not manifest that the Nature both of the Waves of the Sea and the Waters of the River, are changed? The River Marah was so very bitter, that the thirsty People could not Drink of it. Moses put Wood into the Water, and the Nature of Water laid aside its Bitterness, which Grace suddenly Infused, moderated. In the time of Eliseus the Prophet, one of the Sons of the Prophets shook off the Iron from his Ax, and it immediately sunk. He that had lost his Iron, begs of Eliseus; Eliseus also put Wood

Wood into the Water, and the Iron swim, and we know this was preter-natural: For the Species (Nature) of the Iron is heavier than the Liguor of the Water. We observe then that Grace is of greater Power than Nature, and yet hitherto we mention only the Grace of Prophetick-Benediction. Then comes in what T. B. adds.

Now if Humane-Benediction were of such force as to change Nature, what shall we say of the divine Consecration, when the Words of our Lord and Saviour work the Effect? For the Sacrament which you receive, is effected by the Words of Christ. Here T. B. stops without making any mark of any break in his Paper, but St. Ambrose goes on thus.

But if the Word of Elijah was of so great force as to fetch down Fire from Heaven, will not the Word of Christ be of force enough (ut Species mutet Elementorum) to change the Nature of the Elements.

Then it follows thus in T. B's Paper. You have read of all the Works of the World, that he Spake and they were made; he Com-manded and they were Created. The Word therefore of Christ, which could make of nothing what was not, cannot it change the Things which are, into what they were not? For it is no less a Matter to give new Natures to Things, than it is to change them.

Then St. Ambrose adds what T. B. omits. But what need of Arguments? Let us use his own Examples, and by that of the Incarnation, let us confirm the Truth of the Mystery. Did the course of Nature precede, when the Lord Jesus was Born of Mary? If we consider Order; a Woman conceives not without a Man. It is manifest then, that it was beside the order of Nature for a Virgin to bear. And this which we make, is the Body from the Virgin. Why dost thou here seek the order of Nature in Christ's Body, since the Lord Jesus himself was Born of the Virgin in a preter-natural Manner? And that was the true Flesh of Christ which was Crucified and Buried. This then is truly the Sacrament of his Flesh. The Lord Jesus himself says, This is my Body. Before the Benediction of the heavenly Words (alia Species nominatur) it is called another kind of Being. After Consecration the Body of Christ is signified. (Here T. B's Translation is all Blunder and Non-sense, for want of consulting the Author himself) He declares it his Blood. Before Consecration it is said to be another thing, after Consecration it is called Blood. And you say Amen, i. e. it is true, what the Mouth speaks let the Soul confess, what the Word imports let the Affections perceive.

§. 72. These are St. Ambrose's Words at large; What are T. B's Arguments from them? Only thus, *What Expressions? What Proofs? How plain and how full?* But very wisely leaves us to guess what these Expressions and Proofs are, and save him the labour of considering; which might have convinced him that St. Ambrose is no Patron of his Cause. Let me then guess at these full Proofs.

§. 73. 1. Is this a full Proof, that he prefers the Eucharist before Manna and the Rock? *As Light is better than a Shadow, and Truth than the Figure; so the Body of the Creator than heavenly Manna.* But may it not be better without a substantial Change? May not the Eucharist be called *Light* in comparison of those legal Signs, as it is a more clear Sign from the Manifestation of Christ in the Flesh, and from the plain Words of Institution declarative of its Nature and Use? Whereas the Signs typifying Christ to come, were obscure and only *Shadows of good Things to come.* May it not be called *Truth* in comparison of legal Figures, which were more enigmatical? As we say of the Picture of a Man drawn exactly to the Life, this is *such an one himself*; or as the legal Signs were Figures of our Evangelical Sacraments, at the Institution of which they were abolished. May not the Excellency of the Eucharist, consist in the Use and Efficacy above those legal Signs? As St. Ambrose himself

Amb. Ep. 77. says, *Many kinds of Baptisms went before, because that one true Sacrament of Baptism by Water and the Spirit was to follow, in which Man is redeemed.* To this may be added all that I have said to this purpose, above in my Answer to St. Basil's Testimony.

§. 74. 2. Is this a full proof of Transubstantiation, *That it is not what Nature formed, but what the Benediction hath Consecrated?* And what is this, but that now it is not mere Bread as Nature formed it, but a Sacrament into which the Benediction consecrated it? When St. Chrysostome says of the Baptized, *That now they are no more Men.* And Leo, that after Baptism a Man is not the same as before, but the Body of the Regenerate is the Flesh of him that was Crucified: And when St. Ambrose says of Sanctification, *Thou thy self was an old Creature, but after thou art Consecrated, thou begins to be a new Creature.* I hope these all meant no substantial Change. Water in Baptism is not meer Water as Nature formed it, and yet there is no substantial Change there pretended, nor consequently can by such a Phrase be proved in the Eucharist. But

Chrys. in Act. Hom. 23.
De Sacram. l. 4. c. 4.

S. 75. 3. Is this the plain Proof which immediately follows, *That the Power of the Benediction is greater, than that of Nature, because Nature it self is chang'd by the Benediction?* Yet tho' the change of Nature in the *Rod turn'd into a Serpent*, and the *Rivers into Blood* (which are all that T. B. after Cardinal *Parron*, and others very unfaithfully and sophistically Transcribes) were substantial, yet the change of Nature in the *Red Sea* and *Jordan*, the *Waters of Marah*, and the *Iron swimming*, by all which St. *Ambrose* illustrates the same Matter, were not substantial, but only accidental. Nor can the preternatural Conception of the *Virgin Mary* have any thing in it of a substantial Change. So that of *Seven Examples* we have the odds of *Five to Two* on our side. And where then is the plain, the full Proof T. B. Boasts of? If when St. *Ambrose* says, *The Nature of the Waves of the Sea, and of the Waters in the River is chang'd*, he meant only an accidental Change, what Reason is there to infer a substantial, because he says, *The Nature of the Bread is Chang'd?* See what I have said to this purpose above in Answer to T. B's. Testimony out of *Pseudo-Cyprianus*. To which add, That St. *Ambrose* speaking of the *Iron made to swim*, observes, *That Grace there was more Powerful than Nature*, and yet the Change there was not substantial.

S. 76. 4. Is this the full Proof, that St. *Ambrose* says, *The Species of the Elements are chang'd?* But are there not two Species or Kinds of Elements in the Eucharist, *Bread and Wine?* And do not we allow a Change, a real Sacramental Change in both Species? And is not that a Change in the Species of the Elements without a Transubstantiation? St. *Chrysostome* says of the *Fire in Chrys. in Psal.* the *Babylonish Furnace*, and of the *Lions*, into whose Den *Daniel* 10. was cast, *that the Elements forgetting their own Nature, were chang'd into that, which was profitable for them, the wild Beasts were no longer wild Beasts, nor the Furnace a Furnace.* And must Rhetorick be trump't upon us for Demonstration, and Flourishes of Eloquence be cry'd up for a full Proof of what was never intended? Lastly, Is this the full Proof, that he says, *This which we make, is the Body from the Virgin?* We allow it to be the Body Born of the Virgin, as well as the Body that was given and broken for us, only we understand it Mystically and Sacramentally, and so doth St. *Ambrose*. I prove it thus. He says just after, *That was the true Flesh of Christ which was Crucified, which was Buried: This is truly the Sacrament of his Flesh.* For as *Bertram de Corpore & Sanguine Domini*, observes, *How distinctly, how prudently does St. Ambrose here distinguish of the Flesh of Christ which was Crucified?* He saith, *it is the true Flesh of Christ, but of that which*

Amb. l. 4. de
Sacrament.

which is taken in the Sacrament, he saith, it is truly the Sacrament of his Flesh; distinguishing the Sacrament of Flesh from the Truth of Flesh. This is put out of doubt by a Passage of St. Ambrose hinted at above (for your Writers will need have it to be his, tho' it be at best but a dubious Piece.) If there were so much Force in the Speech of our Lord Jesus, that the Things which were not, began to be (viz. at the Creation) how much more is the same powerful (speaking of the Eucharist) to make, that Things may still be that which they were, and yet be chang'd into another Thing? If you ask how it can be chang'd into another Thing, and yet remain what it was before, he illustrates it by this Comparison, Thou thy self was an old Creature, but after thou was Sanctify'd, thou began to be a new Creature. As then a Man sanctify'd remains what he was before, a Man, and yet is chang'd into another Thing: So the Bread consecrated remains what it was before, true substantial Bread, and yet is chang'd into another Thing, the Sacrament of Christ's Body. So that by my fifth Rule St. Ambrose's Testimony alledg'd by T. B. is no Proof of Transubstantiation, because he plainly teaches the substance of the Elements after Consecration to remain as they were before. These Words, *ut sint que erant*, tho' in all former Editions of St. Ambrose, yet were very wisely (how honestly let the World judge) left out of the Roman Edition of that Father, and that at Paris, 1603. and so Alexander-like they cut the Knot, which they want Skill to untie. As our Learned Usher hath observ'd.

Ush. Answ. to
Jesuists, ch. 14.

§. 78. And now where are T. B's Exultations? Where are his full Words and plain Proofs of Transubstantiation? Since there cannot be a more full Witness than St. Ambrose against it, who in the Passage cited by T. B. says nothing but what agrees very well with the Sentiments of Protestants; and in this last, out of his fourth Book, *de Sacram.* Determines point Blank against the Romanists? I shall conclude with a Passage out of the said Father, who says expressly, *It is not the Bread which passes into the Body, but the Bread of Eternal Life, which strengtheneth the Substance of our Soul.* Where he not only calls it Bread after Consecration, Bread which goes to our Nourishment (which therefore must retain the substance of Bread still) but he distinguishes it from the Bread of Eternal Life, which supports the Soul? Which sure is to be understood of Divine Grace, and not of any bodily Substance.

Amb. l. 5. c.
4. de Sacram.

T. B. §. 11.

§. 79. (10.) St. Augustine is T. B's tenth Witness, who as all the rest have done, will say nothing for him, much against him.

1. His first Testimony is out of l. 9. c. 13. of his *Confessions*, where his dying Mother desir'd to be remembred at the Altar, from whence the *Holy Victim* was dispens'd. What is here for Transubstantiation? Is it the name *Altar*, or *Victim*, or the *Dispensing* the one from the other? We allow all that, and can see no necessity to grant from that a Transubstantiation. We believe with the Fathers a Commemorative Sacrifice in the Eucharist, and therefore retain the name *Altar*; and the Eucharist may be call'd a *Victim*, as it is call'd the Body which was given for us, as being the Sacrament thereof. And if St. *Augustine* be allow'd to Explain himself, he says in the same place of his Mother, *At whose Sacrament of our Redemption thy Handmaid had bound her Soul by the Bond of Faith.* So that by the *Holy Victim* he meant no more than the Sacrament of our Redemption. And what wonder that St. *Augustine*, who teaches that Christ doubted not to call the Sign of his Body by the name of his Body, call'd the Sacrament of our Redemption, the sacred *Victim*, wherewith was cancell'd the Hand-Writing against us? And yet favour Transubstantiation no more in this Expression than in that? This T. B. was aware of, and therefore sends us

§. 80. 2. To St. *Augustine*, on Ps. 88. but I find he sends us where he never was himself, since what he cites is not to be found there, but in his Explication of Ps. 98. Besides, if T. B. had ever read St. *Augustine* in that place, I have so great a Confidence in his Ingenuity, that I am perswaded he would have took notice of the Fathers own Explication of the Passage he cites, which turns all into a very full and pregnant Argument for us against Transubstantiation. For thus he goes on a few Lines after what T. B. cites. *When thou adorest him, let not thy Thoughts dwell on the Flesh, lest thou should'st not be quicken'd by the Spirit.* For, says he, (i. e. Christ) *the Spirit quickeneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing.* When our Lord commandeth this, saying to them as he had said before of his Flesh, *Except a Man Eat my Flesh, he has not Eternal Life in him.* Upon this, some of his Disciples almost Seventy were Scandaliz'd, and said, *This is a hard saying, who can understand it? And they departed, and walk'd no more with him.* This of *Eating his Flesh*, &c. seem'd an hard saying, for they understood it Foolishly, and thought of it Carnally, and imagin'd that our Lord was about to cut off some parcels of his Body to give to them; and they said, this is an hard saying: But it was they that were hard; not the saying; for if they had not been hard, but meek, they would have said within themselves, he says not this without a Cause, but by Reason of some Sacrament hid there, they had staid meekly with

with him, and learn'd that from him which his Disciples that tarry'd did learn—For he instructed those, and told them, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, &c. the Words that I have spoken to you are Spirit and Life. Understand spiritually what I have said; for it is not this Body you see, which you are to Eat, nor that Blood which my Crucifiers will spill, that you are to drink. I have commended to you the Sacrament, which being spiritually understood, shall quicken you.*

§. 81. And now after St. *Augustine's* Comment on himself, let us consider T. B's. Argument. For it is a Rarity that he offers to frame any Arguments on his Testimonies, and therefore ought not to be slighted, when he does: Tho' its probable he may already see the Invalidity of them. *We adore what we Eat, what we adore is the Body of Christ, Ergo, we Eat the Body of Christ.* I grant all with St. *Augustine's* own Interpretation. We Eat it Spiritually, and in a Sacrament: Not that *Body* which the Disciples saw, not that *Blood* which his Crucifiers shed, but a *Sacrament*, which being Spiritually understood giveth Life. But against St. *Augustine* himself T. B. urges, that it is impossible to verify these Words by a Figure. Because, if apprehending Christ by Faith be the Eating of him, he cannot be ador'd before he be Eaten, because he must be apprehended by Faith before he can be ador'd, unless St. *Augustine* must be suppos'd to teach People to adore they know not what. I answer to this. That a *Sacramental* Manducation is a different Act from apprehending of Christ by Faith. We first believe the Word made Flesh, and suffering in the Flesh for us, then adore him, and after that in the Sacrament Spiritually eat his Flesh, and drink his Blood. More plainly, There is a *Spiritual* Manducation without the Sacrament, which is a believing of Christ's Incarnation and Passion, this precedes Adoration: And there is a *Sacramental* Manducation, a receiving Christ by Faith in the Sacrament, which follows it. And this is plainly St. *Augustine's* Doctrin.

T. B. §. 12. §. 82. 3. T. B. cites next a Passage of the same St. *Augustine*, the Title of Ps. 33. whence taking occasion to turn to the History it refers to, 1 Sam. 21. 13. there is this Passage according to the 72 Translation, *καρπὸς ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ. He was carry'd in his Hands.* This according to the Letter cannot be understood of David, so he understands it of Christ, who was carry'd in his Hands when commending his Body, he said this is my Body. For then he carry'd his Body in his Hands.

§. 83. To say nothing of the mistaken Translation, St. *Augustine* follows, for which there is no countenance in the Hebrew, I will consider St. *Augustine's* Meaning, and T. B's Argument up-

on it. In the very next Sermon on the same Psalm, St. Augustine thus explains himself, *How was he carry'd in his own Hands? Because when he commended his own Body and Blood, he took that in his Hands which the Faithful know, and did (quodammodo) in some sort carry his Body in his Hands.* Sure that *quodammodo* in some sort is a plain Intimation enough, that he did not mean properly, and in the absurd Sense of Transubstantiation. However the other Expression puts it out of doubt, *That which the Faithful know.* For by this he meant to Conceal something from those that were not admitted to the Sacrament (the Catechumens,) which they that were admitted to the Sacrament, and were call'd the Faithful, very well knew. Now the Bread was what here he would not expressly Name, but only Hint at as what was known to the Faithful. And abundant Instances might be produc'd out of Theodoret, and other Fathers of the like manner of speaking, when they would not name the Elements. But to confine myself to St. Augustine, speaking of Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, he says, *They that Read know what Melchizedec brought forth (it was Bread and Wine) when he Bless'd Abraham, and they that partake of it, see such a Sacrifice now offer'd to God through the World.* Hence it is evident, that this is St. Augustine's Meaning, that because Christ took Bread in his Hands, recommending it to his Disciples for his Body, he did in a sort, as it were carry his Body in his Hands. Which yet is more clear from what Bede says on the same Psalm. *Christ (says he) was carry'd (quodammodo) in a manner in his own Hands, when in the last Supper he reach'd the Bread consecrated and commended by his own Mouth to his Disciples, saying, this is my Body.* And having in this, as well as in the former Testimonies, St. Augustine on our side Interpreting himself not according to the Sense of the Roman Church, but of ours, let us consider what T. B. argues against him and us. *Can we (says he) imagin the flaming witted St. Augustine would have been so puzz'd in finding out how David might have carry'd his own Picture, if at the very same time (according to Protestants) he intended to say no more than that Christ carry'd his? I answer.* In this cited Passage, St. Augustine supposes it impossible in a gross Sense, that any Man can carry his own Body in his Hand. *For how (says he) can any Body understand it to be perform'd by Man?* He next observes, *That according to the Letter, or History, there is nothing said of David's carrying his Body in his Hand in any Sense.* So that the Phrase cannot be accommodated to David, who carry'd not, that we Read of any where in the Letter, his Body in his Hand in any figurative Sense of the Phrase. It must then (as he infers) be under-

stood of Christ, whom he oft stiles the *Spiritual David*, who when he commended his own Body and Blood to his Disciples, took the Bread (that which the Faithful know) in his Hand, and so in some sort carry'd his Body in his Hand. Let T. B. find any Passage in the Letter of the History, to which this Phrase can in any Sense be accommodated to him, and then we will allow the flaming witted St. Augustine puzzl'd to no purpose.

§. 84. And having thus interpreted St. Augustine by himself, and vindicated his own Interpretation from T. B's Objection, I shall before I leave this Matter, add some Arguments to prove, That St. Augustine cannot be understood in that absurd Sense T. B. would put on him. As

Aug. Tract. 30. in many Places. On those Words, *Me you have not always: He* speaks, says he, of the Presence of his Body. *Ye shall have me according to my Providence, according to Majesty and invisible Grace, but according to the Flesh, which the Word assum'd, according to that which was Born of the Virgin Mary, ye shall not have me. Therefore because he convers'd with his Disciples forty Days, he ascended up into Heaven, and is not here.*

Aug. Ep. 23. §. 85. 2. He compares Baptism with the Eucharist in this Respect. If the Sacrament, says he, had not some resemblance of those Things whereof they are Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all, but from this resemblance they take for the most part the Names of the Things which they represent. Therefore as the Sacrament of the Body of Christ is in some Manner or Sense Christ's Body, and the Sacrament of his Blood is the Blood of Christ, so the Sacrament of Faith (meaning Baptism) is Faith. Upon which Words of St. Augustine there is this remarkable Gloss in the Canon-Law, The Heavenly Sacrament, which truly represents the Flesh of Christ is call'd the Body of Christ, but improperly; whence it is said, that after a manner, but not according to the Truth of the Thing, but the Mystery of the Thing signify'd: So that the meaning is, it is call'd the Body of Christ, that is, it signifies the Body of Christ. And I desire to know, how any Protestant could express himself more plainly against Transubstantiation, than St. Augustine thus explain'd by the Gloss of their own Canon-Law here does.

Aug. Tract. 30. in Joh. id. Tract. 25. id. Tract. 26. §. 86. 3. St. Augustine teaches our Eating of Christ to be Spiritual and not Carnal. How, says he, shall I send up my Hand into Heaven, to take hold on Christ sitting there? Send thy Faith, and thou hast hold of him. Again, Why preparest thou thy Teeth and thy Belly? Believe, and thou hast Eaten. And again, For this is to Eat the Living Bread, to Believe in him. He that believeth in him eateth. He is invisibly fed, because he is invisibly regenerated.

He

He is inwardly a Babe, inwardly Renew'd, where he is Renew'd, there is he Nourish'd.

§. 87. 4. St. *Augustine* declares against the possibility of Accidents subsisting without their Subject, which Transubstantiation supposes, and the Patrons of it all affirm. *Who*, says he, can grant or think it possible, that that which is in a Subject (i. e. depending on it for its being) can continue, when the Subject it self is perish'd? For it is a monstrous Thing, and as far as can be from Truth, that that which would have no being, but for the Subject in which it is, can still have a being when its Subject hath none. Aug. Soliloq. l. 2. c. 12.

§. 88. And now I dare Appeal to all the unbiass'd and impartial World, yea, and to T. B. himself, if he be not bigotted to his Perswasion, whether the flaming witted St. *Augustine* would ever have made Transubstantiation a burning Doctrin? And whether the Flame of his Wit doth not give more Light and cherishing Influences to the Doctrin of the Church of *England*, than the Church of *Rome* in this Matter of the Eucharist?

§. 89. (11.) T. B's. next Witness is *Cyril. Alexandrinus*, lib. 4. T. B. §. 13. *contr. Nestorium*, c. 5. And this is another Instance of his Care in citing the Fathers; for the Passage he Transcribes is not there to be found, but in his *Comment. in Joh. l. 10.* it is to be met with.

I could have wish'd that here T. B. had not barely transcrib'd, but oblig'd me with his Arguments, that I might have known what he infers from this Testimony, and on what Words he grounds his Inferences. If he bring it to his purpose, he must intend it for a Proof, *That the substance of Bread and Wine are chang'd into the substance of Christ's Body and Blood*, which is the Doctrin he hath undertaken to prove. Let us then see, what *Cyril* affords for his purpose.

§. 90. Is this it, that he says, *Christ dwells in us Corporally by Participation and Communion of his Holy Flesh*? But — 1. Does *Christ dwell in the Faithful corporally* in the gross Sense? For do not the *Romanists* determine that *Christ's Body* stays no longer, than till the Accidents of the Elements be corrupted? So that *Christ* can dwell Bodily in the Faithful, only in respect of the Efficacy of his Flesh. As the same Father says of the Elements in the Eucharist, that they are chang'd (*αὐτὸς ἐνέσχηκεν τῷ εὐχάριστι σαρκε*) Cyril. Alex. Comment. in Joh. l. 4. into the Efficacy of his Flesh. — 2. Does he not say afterward in the Place cited by T. B.? *No other way can what is Corruptible be enliven'd*, than by being corporally united to the Body of him, who is Life its self, that is the only Begotten Son. I ask then whether none of the Ancients, who dy'd before the Institution of the Eucharist, shall be quicken'd by *Christ*? If so, they are corporally

Cyr. Alex. in
Job. l. 11. c.
26.

rally united to him without a corporal Eating of his Flesh.—
3. St. Cyril teaches, That the Union of Christians with Christ is in the same manner as their Union with one another; who tho' divided in respect of Place, yet by Reason of their mystical Union with Christ are one Body. *He made us, says he, one Body with himself, and with one another, - Blessing the Faithful with his one Body by the mystical Communion. For who can think that those who are united in one Christ in the Union of one Body, to be separated from this natural Union? For if we all Eat one Bread, we are all made one Body. And (as he adds a little after) are joyn'd together by a corporal Union. And yet I hope T. B. will allow us to understand this in a Spiritual and Mystical, and not in a gross and carnal Sense. And if we by the Eucharist are united corporally to one another in the same manner as Christ is to us, that Union cannot infer a Transubstantiation; but may be in the one Case, as it must be in the other, by the virtue and spiritual Efficacy of Christ's Flesh.*

§ 91. Again, Is it this T. B. would infer Transubstantiation from, That he says, St. Paul writes, that the Gentiles are made Con-corporeal, Con-participal, and Co-heirs of Christ? And how are they made Con-corporeal? To wit, by Participation of the honour'd Eucharist. So T. B. Translates *ἀξιοδύστα γὰρ μετάρχεω τῆς εὐλογίας, τῆς μυστικῆς*, but how truly let him judge now he sees the Original; And why may we not be Con-corporeal with Christ, without a substantial Change in the Eucharist, by the Efficacy of Christ's Flesh, and Participation of the Mystical Benediction? As by Baptism the Apostle says, we are made one Body with Christ, and that too without any substantial Change of the Water into Christ by the one Spirit. For by one Spirit, says he, we are all Baptiz'd into one Body. But so much hath been said about our Union to Christ in my Answer to St. Hilary's Testimony above, that I need to say no more here. Only to observe Two Things.—1. That the Comparison of two pieces of Wax melted down into one, urg'd in a strict and literal Sense, would infer that the Particles of Christ's Body were mix'd with all the Parts of our Bodies by such a proper Contact as Vasquez will not allow, and therefore must be interpreted with some allowances to denote only an Union (*per contactum virtutis, non substantie*) of Virtue and Efficacy, and not of Substance.—2. That St. Cyril in innumerable Places teaches, That our Lord in respect of his Body is now absent from us, nor will be in that respect present with us till the Consummation of all Things, but only by the Presence of his Spirit and his Divinity.

Vasquez disput.
204. c. 4. n.
30.

§ 92. (12.) And

§. 92. (12. And now I come to T. B's 12th Witneſs, *Leo the T. B. §. 14. Great.* But tho' he produces his Words, he cites no place, but leaves me to ſeek for them my ſelf: It is out of Serm. 6. *de jejun. ſeptimi Menſis*; where he Diſputes againſt the *Eutychians* that denied the reality of Chriſt's Fleſh in the Incarnation, and tells them, That they ought ſo to partake of this Holy Table, as not to doubt of the Truth of Chriſt's Body and Blood. Implying that the Hereticks, *Ignatius* ſpeaks of in T. B's firſt Teſtimony, acted more conſiſtently with themſelves, who would have no Eucharift, becauſe they would not confeſs the Truth of Chriſt's Fleſh, than theſe *Eutychians* that came to the Eucharift, the Sacrament of Chriſt's Body and Blood, and yet denied the reality of his Fleſh in his Incarnation, of which it was, in *Tertullian's* Style, a Figure; ſuch a Figure as ſuppoſed the reality of that, whereof it was a Figure. And therefore when he adds, *That is received by the Mouth which is believed by Faith, and they answer Amen in vain, who diſpute againſt what they receive.* He means when the Prieſt diſtributing the Eucharift ſays, *The Body, &c. the Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt,* (according to the uſual Form) the *Eutychian* ſays *Amen* with his Mouth, which implies his belief of Chriſt's real Body, but diſputing againſt the Fleſh of Chriſt which he receives in this Sacrament of it, he ſays *Amen* in vain. So that this Father aſſerts not the corporal, carnal Preſence of Chriſt in the Eucharift, but argues the *Eutychians* of Abſurdity, that take the Sacrament of Chriſt's Body, and yet deny the reality of his Incarnation. For that which is taken by the Mouth is believed in the Heart; i. e. becauſe thoſe Symbols of Chriſt's Body and Blood which are received by the Mouth, are by receiving of them profeſſed to be believed in the Heart, to be the Symbols of a true Body and true Blood. To conclude, may not T. B. with as much reaſon conclude, that we of the Church of England believe Tranſubſtantiation, as from theſe Words that *Leo* did? For when the Prieſt diſtributes the Elements, he ſays, *The Body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which was given for thee.* And the Communicant ſays *Amen*, i. e. ſo it is, receiving it as ſuch, and not diſputing againſt what he receives, but believing with his Heart what he receives with his Mouth, that he ſpiritually Eats the Fleſh of Chriſt and Drinks his Blood. *Leo de Nat. ſays of Chriſtians, we are the Fleſh of Chriſt taken from the Virgin's Womb.* What Triumphs had there been, if he had uſed ſuch an Expreſſion about the Eucharift? And yet it would have been no better a proof of the ſubſtantial Change of the Bread into Chriſt's Fleſh, than this is of a Chriſtian's ſubſtantial change into Chriſt's Fleſh. The Body of the Regenerate (as he ſays elſewhere)

is the Flesh of the Crucified; and thence I may conclude, there is as much a Transubstantiation in baptismal Regeneration as in the Eucharist.

T. B. §. 15. §. 93. 13. And now comes T. B's last Witness to be Examined, Gregory the Great. The Words he cites are in *Hom. 22. in Evangel.* tho' T. B. forgets to tell us so. *What is the Blood of the Lamb? You have learnt not now by Hearing, but by Drinking: Which Blood is put upon both Posts, when it is drunk not only by the Mouth of the Body, but also by the Mouth of the Heart.* And is this any thing toward the Proof of Transubstantiation? May not all this be said of sacramental Blood? Does not Gregory just after call them the Sacraments of our Redeemer? And can the Sacraments of our Redeemer be our Redeemer himself? St. August. *de verb. Apost. Serm. 2.* excellently Explains this Passage of Gregory's, where he says, *The Body and Blood of Christ will be Life to every one, if what is taken visibly in the Sacraments, be Eaten spiritually, and spiritually Drunk in the Truth it self: For here he shews, that there are two ways of Eating Christ's Body and Drinking his Blood: One Visible when we Eat and Drink the sacramental Elements, which in Gregory is drinking his Blood with our Mouth; the other Spiritual, when we receive Christ verily and indeed in our Heart.* Nay, in the Words that immediately follow what T. B. cites, St. Gregory explains himself thus, *For the Blood of the Lamb is laid on both Posts, when the Sacrament of his Passion is taken with the Mouth for our Redemption, and is contemplated with an attentive Mind for our Imitation.*

§. 94. And thus I have considered all T. B's Testimonies out of the Fathers. A Grand Jury he hath Impannelled, thirteen to the Dozen, but so unhappy is he, or rather so forlorn and desperate his Cause, that tho' he had the choice of his Jury himself, he is plainly Convicted by the unanimous Verdict of his own Pannel: Since without transgressing his own Rules of Expounding the Fathers, I have made it appear, that not one of the Testimonies alledged, give the least countenance to Transubstantiation; and that all the Fathers he produces, either in the very places he cites, or in other parts of their Writings, teach Doctrins repugnant to it and inconsistent with it. So that T. B. may with Shame reflect on the bold and groundless Determinations of the Council of Trent, that the Holy Catholic Church hath been always perswaded, that upon Consecration the whole substance of the Bread is changed into the substance of the Body of Christ, and the whole substance of the Wine into the substance of his Blood. Since for the first Six hundred Years after Christ, he

he cannot produce one Father that Teaches this. I wish T. B. would learn of the *English Jesuits*, cited by our Learned Bishop *Cousins*, in his *History of Transubstantiation*, p. 127. (*Watson in quod lib. 1. 2. art. 4.* and the Author's *Discurs. modest. de Jesuit.* p. 13.) who honestly and fairly Acknowledge, *Rem Transubstantiationis Antiqui Patres ne attigerunt quidem.*

§. 95. And now I beseech Mr. T. as he values the Salvation of his Soul, seriously to consider what Safety there can be for him to continue any longer in the Communion of a Church, whose *Idolatry in adoring the Host*, he cannot but see to be most Gross and Inexcusable, since Transubstantiation (which only could excuse it) hath neither the Sacred *Scriptures* or Holy *Fathers* to support it, but both so fully concurring to confute it.

TO H. M. S.

R E P L Y.

(1) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (2) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (3) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (4) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (5) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (6) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (7) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (8) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (9) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (10) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (11) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (12) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (13) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (14) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (15) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (16) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (17) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (18) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (19) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (20) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (21) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (22) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (23) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (24) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (25) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (26) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (27) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (28) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (29) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (30) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (31) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (32) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (33) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (34) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (35) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (36) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (37) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (38) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (39) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (40) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (41) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (42) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (43) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (44) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (45) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (46) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (47) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (48) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (49) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (50) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (51) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (52) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (53) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (54) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (55) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (56) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (57) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (58) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (59) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (60) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (61) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (62) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (63) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (64) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (65) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (66) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (67) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (68) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (69) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (70) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (71) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (72) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (73) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (74) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (75) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (76) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (77) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (78) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (79) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (80) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (81) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (82) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (83) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (84) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (85) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (86) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (87) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (88) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (89) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (90) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (91) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (92) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (93) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (94) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (95) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (96) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (97) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (98) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (99) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the
 (100) In answer to the Misleading Account I gave of the

T. B's.

ANSWER

To H. N's.

REPLY.

(1.) **I**N Answer to the satisfactory Account I gave of the *Roman* Chatholick Belief, concerning the real and substantial Presence of Christ in the blessed Eucharist, its objected, *That the Papers I sent Feb. 15. are not the same I read at our Meeting.*

H. N. S. 1.

(2.) To which is Reply'd, That they are the same in Substance, and contain the very same Arguments, tho' perhaps more directly and closely Worded, to clear the Difficulties I perceiv'd H. N. to labour under. I'm sorry my good Will offends him: Besides, I intended no more, in that short Paper I Read, than to have left him the Heads of our Conference; but when I perceiv'd he had prepar'd a long Paper, with more Arguments than two or three Hours would admit; I desir'd I might add some things to mine to make it Answerable: To which he seem'd then willingly to consent, tho' now he complains. I wonder the more at it, because he knows I have receiv'd the Appendixes and Changes he has been pleas'd to make, with all the Civility imaginable.

(3.) Against that part of my Discourse which supports this major Proposition (whether we be Eye-witnesses of our Saviour's and his Apostle's Miracles applying reveal'd Truths, or have an assur'd continuance of them so apply'd, our Faith is equally secur'd)

cur'd) there is nothing objected: But against the other part of it, which supports this Minor (*Roman Catholicks* have such an assur'd continuance of the real and substantial Presence of Christ in the blessed Eucharist) there are so many Objections made, and so contradictory, that they seem design'd rather to divert the Reader from the evident Consequences of my Arguments, than to establish the contrary. However taking the Liberty, which I hope may be allow'd, to range my Adversary's Objections in the order they directly attack me, I doubt not to shew that they are so far from weakning our Belief in this point, that they afford a fair Occasion of establishing it so strongly, that no Man of reasonable Application and Capacity, can without offence to Reason, refuse his Assent to it.

(4) My first Argument for such an assur'd Continuance, was the Authority of the whole visible Church, when it was first openly oppos'd by *Berengarius* in the Eleventh Century. This Authority is prov'd by five Western Councils, one at *Vercells*, one at *Tours*, and three at *Rome*. I might have added five more at *Brion*, *Paris*, *Roan*, *Poitiers* and *Bourdeaux*. The Silence of the East, where so many western Councils cou'd not but be known, argues her Consent, considering the Debates then on foot between *Leo the Ninth* and *Michael Cerularius Nicetas*, &c. concerning leaven'd and unleaven'd Bread, &c. The silence of *Berengarius* upon his Adversary's Challenge, to name a *Gracian* or an *Armenian*, or any Town or Village wherever his contrary Sentiment was profess'd, confirms it. And why may we not suppose, that he was as diligent in seeking such a Protection to his Cause, as the *German Lutherans* have since been in seeking it from *Jeremy*, the *Constantinopolitan Patriarch*, by whom they were rejected? The Consent of the Eastern Church, is further confirmed from the fourth *Lateran Council*, in which were present the four Eastern Patriarchs, two of them in Person, and the other two by their Deputies. 'Tis farther confirm'd from the *Florentine Council*, in which were present the *Gracian Emperor*, *John Paleologus*, *Joseph*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, with Twenty more Prelates of the first Rank, bringing along with them legal Deputations from the three Patriarchs of *Jerusalem*, *Antioch* and *Alexandria*. 'Tis yet farther confirm'd from two Synods holden at *Constantinople*, one by *Cyril ab Iberia* (not at *Iberia*, as *H. N.* mistakes, and pretends to make a Blunder where there is none) a Country lying to the *Caspian Sea*, from whence he may as likely have deriv'd his Birth, as from *Beroe* in *Thrace*, a thing impertinent and not

In Resp. prima
& secunda.

MM . M . H

worth taking Exceptions at; and the other by *Parthenius* his Successor. 'Tis lastly confirm'd beyond all Dispute, by Dr. *Potter*, p. 225. out of *Nicetas Thesaur. Orthod. Euthimius Panop. Jerom. C. P. Respons. 1 and 2 ad Lutheran*: And by Bishop *Forbe's de Euch. l. 1. c. 3.* out of *Nichol. Cabas. Marc. Ephes. and Besarion*. And by Protestant's Inability of procuring so much as one Authentick Attestation to the contrary, notwithstanding our continual Trade to the Eastern Parts, in opposition to so many procur'd by Mr. *Arnould*.

(5.) 'Tis true these Councils, these Synods, these Authors, and these Attestations, alledg'd in Confirmation of the Eastern Church agreeing with the Western, at least some of them are posteriour to the Eleventh Century. But neither Catholicks nor Protestants finding any Footsteps of their Change in this Point, since that time they cannot reasonably charge them with it, or think them to have taught otherwise than in their Predecessors, than their Predecessors teach now in them.

(6.) 'Tis true likewise the Eastern Church for the most part holds fundamental Errors, against the unity of Person, the distinction of Natures in Christ, or the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son: Wherefore as such they are not to be own'd either by Catholicks or Protestants, for a part of the true Church of God. But this hinders not why the continuance of this Doctrin is not hereby firmler Establish'd, being Profess'd even by Enemies equally different to both sides.

(7.) Now let's see how *H. N.* endeavours to overturn this weight of Authority? I find he levels no less than a Baker's Dozen of Objections directly against it.

H. N. §. 18. (8.) First, says he, *The Council of Vercells condemn'd Berengarius unheard*. To which is Answer'd, That upon occasion of his Letter to *Lanfranc* his Cause had been Examn'd, and his Error condemn'd in a precedent Council at *Rome*, under the same *Leo IX.* who presided in the Council of *Vercells*. Moreover having been cited to appear, he only sent two Deputies, and that not to renounce his Error, but to maintain it: There was sufficient reason therefore for his Condemnation, both in his Disobedience and his Obstinacy.

H. N. *Ibid.* (9.) Secondly, *Berengarius appearing in the Council of Tours, declar'd that he believ'd not Bread and Wine to be empty Figures, and subscrib'd his Declaration as the common Opinion of the Church*. To which is Answer'd, That *Berengarius* in the Council of *Tours* took Oath to hold for the future the common Doctrin of the Church: But the Expression, *empty Figures*, is only *H. N.*'s Invention, by which he endeavours to stir upon the unwary, that his

his own Opinion was the common Sentiment of the Church. Such unfair Dealing, when once discover'd, is the greatest Prejudice he can do to his Cause. What the Doctrine of the Church was at that time, is clear out of the two following Councils at Rome, under Nicholas II. and Gregory VII. where the substantial Presence was Subscrib'd and Sworn to by Berengarius.

(10.) Thirdly, As Leo Ostiensis and Sigonius relate the Matter, H. N. c. 19. Leo Ost. in Chron. l. 3. Sig. regn. Ital. l. 9. Berengarius appearing in the Council of Rome, under Nicholas II. defended his Cause so well that none could stand before him, that Alberic the Monk was sent for, who being unable to Dispute with him, Wrote in seven Days some Arguments against him, and thereupon without farther Dispute, he was commanded to Recant under a Form prescribed by Cardinal Humbert. To which is Answer'd, That 'tis much H. N. could croud so much Mistake into so narrow a Compass. For first, Leo Ostiensis, in the Place cited, has not a Word concerning Berengarius. Secondly, Sigonius speaking of him, neither says, That he defended his Cause so well, that none could stand before him; nor that Alberic the Deacon was absent or sent for: Nor that Berengarius was commanded to Recant, but all much otherwise. These are his Words, Berengarius being present in the Council, was order'd to Explain his Sentiment concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, who going about to prove in many Words the Sacrifice of our Saviour's Body and Blood, to be a Figure; Alberic a Deacon, eminent for Learning, desired a Week's time, not being able to contend with him in Voice, to give an Answer in Writing; in which he refuted Berengarius's Opinion, with so many Testimonies of ancient Fathers, that being overcome he could not say a Word for himself. Therefore he abjur'd his Opinion as False in the presence of the Council. Tam multis veterum patrum Testimoniis Opinionem ejus refellit, ut Berengarius victus hincere non potuerit. Itaque opinionem suam ut falsam ipso præsente Concilio abjuravit. Had not H. N. as good have taken Lanfranc's Word, as alledg'd nothing at all out of Leo Ostiensis, and what was worse for him than nothing out of Sigonius? As for the Honour of this Council, which H. N. seems to reflect upon, 'twas no greater prejudice to it to let Alberic a Deacon, Argue against Berengarius, than it was to the first Council of Nice, to let Athanasius a Deacon Argue against Arius: The part of Bishops in a Council, being rather that of Judges than Advocates, and to declare the Depositum of Faith rather than Plead for it. Nor was it any prejudice to Alberic's Prudence, that he chose rather to oppose Berengarius in Writing, which would stand the Test of serious and attentive Consideration, than to contend

with a noisy Adversary, whose Prevalence was only to be fear'd in the Strength of his Breast, and Multiplicity of his Words, the usual Refuge of a bad Cause.

H. N. §. 20. (11.) Fourthly, Berengarius indeed abjur'd his Opinion again in the Council of Rome, under Gregory VII. but it appears by the Acts of the Council, that many of the Bishops there present were of his Mind, and Gregory VII. himself was charg'd with the same, and many other Things, as Necromancy, Sacrilege, &c. To which is Answer'd, That the Acts of the Council contain no such thing, nor can any just or reasonable Person suspect Bishops, who by their Silence or Subscription, approv'd of the Council's Decree to the contrary, to be guilty of such abominable Dissimulation or Connivance. As for Gregory VII. upon the account of his Differences with Henry the Emperor, and his zealous Prosecution of several Prelates and false Pastors upon the account of Simony; 'tis well known he had many bitter Enemies, and was charg'd with grievous Accusations by them, in the Schismatical Cabals of Wormes and Bressia. But neither are the Accusations of Enemies to be regarded, nor can H. N. fix upon Roman Catholicks, any obligation of defending the private Sentiments or personal Actions of any Pope. St. Athanasius and our Saviour himself were tax'd with like Crimes by their Adversaries. What we are to maintain and he to impugn, if he'll do any thing to the purpose, are the Definitions of Pope's *ex Cathedrâ*, or at the Head of legal Councils. The rest is only a sinister way of endeavouring to byass unwary People with Impertinences.

H. N. §. 21. (12.) Fifthly, Berengarius was commended in an Epitaph by Hildebertus Cænonanensis, as William of Malmsbery's Records. To which is Answer'd, that H. N. should have taken Notice of what himself Writes a little after, viz. That William of Malmsbery says, Altho' Berengarius corrected his own Opinion, yet he could not Convert all in the World whom he had Perverted. And what wonder, if after his Abjuration and Repentance he was commended by Hildebert? Upon this H. N. thinks it convenient to contradict what he had said out of William of Malmsbery, and says

Ep. 5.
H. N. *ibid.* (13.) Sixthly, That Berengarius did not quit his Opinion, but Died in it, as Bartholdus Constantiensis relates, to whom, if he would, he might have added Lanfranc. To which is Answer'd, That if these Testimonies be true, then Berengarius was Forsworn, and William of Malmsbery deceiv'd in Matter of Fact, relating to his Repentance, which neither concerns Roman Catholicks nor the present Question.

(14.) Se-

(14.) Seventhly, Berengarius had Followers according to Willi-
am of Malmsbery, tho' T. B. seems to insinuate the contrary. To
which is Answered, That H. N. is welcome to use what liber-
ty he pleases with T. B. : But why does he abuse his own Memo-
ry or Sincerity so much, as to affirm what T. B's Paper, which
lies before him, cannot but reproach him with? Does not T. B.
expressly there Acknowledge upon the Testimony of Durand
and Lanfranc, that Berengarius in his time, had some Followers;
so Few, Vile and Infamous, that no Author has thought them
worth Naming? And I hear of no other that H. N. hath hi-
therto discover'd.

(15.) Eighthly, Berengarius was Threatned before he would ab-
jure his Opinion. To which is answer'd, so were the Arians,
Nestorians and Eutychians, in the Councils of Nice, Ephesus and
Calcedon, allow'd by Protestants as well as Catholicks. And they
were not only Threaten'd but also Punish'd with Excommunicati-
ons, Depositions, Imprisonments, Banishments, without any
Prejudice to the Authority of those Councils.

(16.) Ninthly, Whereas Berengarius's Adversaries, Guit-
mond and Lanfranc, challeng'd him to shew a Grecian or an Ar-
menian, or any Town or Hamlet, wherever his Doctrin was Pro-
fess'd: Had not his Writings been carefully suppress'd, we might
(says H. N.) have produc'd Testimonies out of them against his Ad-
versaries, and given the Lye to those bold Brags. To which is an-
swer'd, That Berengarius himself burnt his Writings in the
Council of Rome, under Nicholas II; and it has no appearance
of Probability, that the Followers of Berengarius, who are pre-
tended to be some Body, would have lost such Testimonies if
ever there had been any thing worth preserving.

(17.) Tenthly, Berengarius might have nam'd not a Village
only, but a Kingdom that then believ'd not the corporal Presence,
as appears from some Saxon Homilies produc'd by Bishop Usher.
To which is answer'd, That the Authority of the then whole-
visible Church, is infinitely preferable to, we do not know
what of, Berengarius's burnt Writings, or we do not know
whom of Homily-Writers, we do not know when. If such Ar-
guments as these were to be taken Notice of in Controversies of
Faith, no Error would need long to want brave imaginary Te-
stimonies of their Predecessors, and wonderful posthumous Au-
thority of nameless Writers.

(18.) Eleventhly, The Council of Lateran never was quoted till
three Hundred Years after it was holden, that sixty Capitula were
propos'd in it, which to some seem'd favourable, to others burthen-
some, and all ended in Laughter. Moreover that there were no
Canons.

Canons decreed in it. To which is answer'd, That here is another stroke of *H. N.*'s Art of crowding much Mistake, with manifest Self-contradiction over and above, into a very narrow Compass. For in the next Paragraph he cites *Matthew Paris*, who flourish'd from within Five to Forty five Years after the said *Lateran Council*: And it will be hard to reconcile mention made within Forty five Years, and no mention made within Three hundred Years after it. To his sixty Capitula, if he will look into the Council, he may add ten more, and make them seventy. And whereas *Mathew Paris* says, That of these Capitula to some seem'd favourable, and to others burthensome. *H. N.* being in a merry Mood, as I suppose, adds of his own, that all ended in Laughter; whilst his Author says no such thing, but gives the true reason why some of the Capitula seem'd burthensome, in that the Pope, *Innocent III.* requir'd considerable Sums of Money from every Bishop present, towards carrying on the Holy War, and made them give Security for it before they left Rome: And what matters it, whether Canons were made in the Council or the Capitula, which are equivalent, were prepar'd by the Pope and approv'd by the Council? That they were so approv'd and cited too, as such, within One hundred Years after: Besides what is alledg'd out of *Mathew Paris*, see *Concil. Bituricense*, 1286, and *Clement. 5. tit. clericis Laicos*, & *tit. de immunit. ecclesi. Quoniam* 1305.

H. N. §. 27. (19.) Twelfthly, *The Eastern Patriarchs present in the Lateran Council, were Natives of France and Italy.* To which is answer'd, That their Election notwithstanding might be good, as several *Gracians* have been *Italian Bishops*, and several *Italians* have been *English Bishops*; and therefore their Approbation of the *Lateran Council*, in regard of the substantial Presence, stands good till *H. N.* finds Proof to overthrow it.

H. N. §. 28. (20.) Thirteenthly, *The Greek Bishops in the Council of Florence, were manag'd to Subscribe more than ever they design'd, and more than that Church would afterwards own.* To which is answer'd, That 'tis contrary to human Justice and common Sense to suppose, That so many Learned and Cautious Prelates as they had shewn themselves in arguing with the *Latin Fathers*, should when they came to Subscribe, so far forget themselves as not to know what they did: And 'tis no less contrary to the same to insinuate, That the *Gracians* refus'd to acquiesce to their Subscriptions upon account of the substantial Presence, which its prov'd by the uncontradicted Doctrine of their Successors, they always held; and not upon account of their Union with the *Latins*, in subscribing that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the
 Fathe

Father by the Son: Which is also the true reason why the *Gracians* have expung'd the first Chapter of the *Lateran Council*. A little Sincerity would have sav'd *H. N.* the labour of Writing so much to so little purpose, and *T. B.* the trouble of Answering it.

(21.) What's pretended that the *Florentine Council* was call'd *H. N. §. ibid.* to Establish the Pope's Primacy, in opposition to the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, is as groundless as the rest. For the Councils of *Basil* and *Florence*, never decreed his Non-primacy; what Deference the Pope may owe to a lawful general Council and the Decrees of it, *H. N.* may leave to our Catholic Divines to dispute among themselves. But whatever it be, it no more prejudices the Pope's Primacy, than the Deference our Kings owe to the Laws made by their Parliaments, which they are Sworn at their Coronations to observe, prejudices the Primacy of our Kings in their temporal Government.

(22.) As for the Council of *Trent*, it's enough for *H. N.*'s Objection to answer, that so much has been Written in Vindication of it, that it makes no matter how much he barely says has been Written to prove its Nullity: And as for the two *Constantinopolitan* Synods, there is no necessity of saying anything, since in his Appendix he corrects the Mistakes of his former Paper, and allows me them both.

(23.) Now I refer it to the Judgment of any rational Man, Whether out of any of these Objections, or all of them together, can be infer'd this Consequence: Therefore so many Patriarchs, Metropolitans, Archbishops and Bishops, assembled in so many Councils, so united with their People, so divided in Interest, so distant in Time and Place, so debarr'd Correspondence; may reasonably be suspected to have concurr'd in Delivering a fatal Error, contrary, as is pretended, to Sense and Reason, and repugnant to Nature, concerning the continu'd Belief of the substantial Presence of Christ in the blessed Eucharist. I can't Imagine *H. N.* himself will undertake to find Logic enough to maintain such a Consequence. Therefore perhaps it is, that not relying much upon these trifling Objections against such an illustrious Authority, he at length comes to these gentle Words.

Tho' Modesty, Prudence, and Reason, obliges the Laity in difficult *H. N. §. 42.*
and doubtful Matters, to give great deference to their spiritual Guides; yet they do not oblige them to put out their own Eyes, and suffer themselves to be led by them, against plain Scriptures, Sense and Reason. But how are these Scriptures plain in *H. N.*'s Sense, if so many Councils, so many Prelates, so many Doctors, for so many

many Ages could not discover it? How can any Man think his Sense and Reason, to penetrate this divine Mystery farther than all they could do? Might not he as well have said Modesty, Prudence and Reason, obliges the Laity to give as great Deference to their spiritual Guides, as they generally give to Rogues they suspect will Cheat them, of Trusting them as far as they can see? If *H. N.* will advise them to go no further, he may exhort them to take leave of *St. Paul* and his spiritual Guidance too, for his defining Faith, an Argument of Things that do not appear.

Hebr. 11.

(24.) After the Authority of the whole visible Church sufficiently propos'd and prov'd good, for the continuance of the Roman Catholic Belief of the substantial Presence, follows an Appeal to every serious Man's Conscience, Whether the Laity of the Eleventh Age could safely have follow'd a condemn'd and abjuring *Berengarius*, a few of his vile Adherents, or their own Judgment, against this illustrious Authority? *H. N.* endeavours to ward this Appeal two Ways. 1. By questioning Roman Catholics how the Laity was secur'd from Error, upon the Roman Council under *Nicholas II.* obliging *Berengarius* to make Profession of his Faith under this Form, *The Body of Christ is not only truly but sensibly Touch'd, Broken and Ground by the Teeth of the Faithful.* To which is answer'd, That this Form has no more Error in it, than those Expressions of *St. Chrysostome.* *Christ suffers himself not only to be Seen, but Touch'd, Eaten, and our Teeth to be fix'd in his Flesh:* Nor than those we daily use in the Catholic Church, of dividing the Host. For if Christ could say, *Who touch'd me?* When the infirm Woman only touch'd his Cloaths, why might not Cardinal *Humbert?* Why might not *St. Chrysostome?* Why may not we say Christ's Body is Seen, Touch'd, Broken and Ground with the Teeth of the Faithful, when the accidental Species of Bread which contain it, and as it were invest it, are Seen, Touch'd, Broken and Ground by them, the Divine Body tho' Immortal and Indivisible in it self, accompanying every Particle as often as the Species is divided?

Hom. 46. in Joan.

H. N. §. 37. (25.) 2dly. *H. N.* endeavours to ward this Appeal by questioning us, How Christians were secured from Error in the time of the *Sirmian Council?* To which is answer'd, that *H. N.* would do well to speak distinctly for fear of deceiving either himself or others. For there were several Councils holden at *Sirmium*, and several Forms of Faith there prescrib'd. The first, third and fourth, were Orthodox tho' not full, as omitting the Word *Consubstantial*, but not denying it. The second was *Arian* and compos'd by *Arians*, as rejecting the Word *Consubstantial*, and declaring

Eccl. de Syn.

claring the Father greater than the Son. The first, third, and fourth Forms might offend some zealous Persons, as too Condescending, but oblig'd none to Error; and as for the second Form, manifestly *Arian*, Christians were then sufficiently guarded from it by the unquestionable Antecedent Councils of *Nice* and *Sardica*, whereas there was never any Antecedent Council to *Berengarius*, which condemn'd the Belief of the substantial Presence, as I shall shew when I come to answer what's objected out of the *Constantinopolitan* Cabal under *Copronimus*.

(26.) After the Appeal follows a Title of Prescription, which H. N. §. 44. H. N. is pleas'd to reflect upon as too Lawyer-like for a Divine: To which is answer'd, that in this he shews he has look'd but a little way into Divinity, not knowing that Right and Justice, where Prescription is particularly handled, make a considerable Treatise of it, and perhaps one of the most necessary for a Spiritual Guide, choose how H. N. comes to be Ignorant of it. Besides the great Importance of a right Administration of Justice, requiring that Law be grounded upon Truth and Reason: Why may not a Man in any Science, or upon any Subject make use of a Principle of the Law, known universally to be so grounded to prove his Intent?

(27.) Wherefore having little Reason to think he could overthrow this strong Title of Prescription with a Flirt, he sets himself to Attack it two other ways; first from the Authority of *Erasmus*, affirming, as 'tis pretended, That 'twas late e're the Church defin'd *Transubstantiation*, unknown to the Ancients both Name and Thing. To which is answer'd, First, That *Erasmus* makes no Court of Judicature answerable to so many Councils as are alledg'd and vindicated. Secondly, Neither Catholics nor Protestants will allow *Erasmus* for either an irreproachable Judge or Deponent, he condemning both *Luther* and *Zuinglius*, and the Catholics condemning him. Thirdly, Upon a careful Examination, *Erasmus* is found to have no such Expression in the Place cited.

(28.) 2dly, H. N. endeavours to overthrow our strong Title of Prescription by a pleasant Story of a Solicitor, which suits exactly with himself. For in the next Words following, he begs the Question, and supposes what he has to prove, that *Berengarianism* was 600 Years before *Berengarius*, which will be no more granted him, than it was granted to his wise Solicitor, that *Hen. VII.* liv'd before *Hen. IV.* whereas we produce the Decrees of so many Councils, as I have mention'd, all declaring a legal Descent of this Truth to us, from the Apostle by an interrupted Continuance

nance and Succession, the Protestants never yet producing one legal Council to the contrary.

l. 3. Cont.
Heresy.

(29.) After the Authority of the whole visible Church ; upon which is grounded an Appeal to Conscience, that cannot be warded, and a Title of Prescription that cannot be revers'd ; which according to the Judgment of St. Irenaus, and Reason it self, could not possibly agree to change the Doctrin of the Apostles, as is shewn hereafter. After these Arguments, I say, follow two Reasons which confirm this Authority, and prove invincibly the visible Church has not chang'd the Apostles Doctrin in this Point of the substantial Presence.

(30.) The first of these Reasons is taken from the Succession of Pastors, in which it is impossible there should not have been known a Complaint made against one Successor or other, Preaching an essential Innovation contrary to his Predecessor, in one Parish or other, in one Diocese or other, at one time or other, before such essential Innovation had possess'd the whole Church, spread over all the World ; but there was never any such Complaint heard or read of in regard of the substantial Presence ; Therefore there has been no such Innovation made, and it is a continu'd Doctrin from the Apostles.

(31.) The second Reason is taken from an Impossibility of such a Change in this great practical and fundamental Point, either total or gradual, as shou'd not have been known to have been contested, or oppos'd, till it had gain'd an universal Acknowledgment. But no such Contest or Opposition is known, tho' we have Ecclesiastical History of all Ages. Therefore there never was any such Change, and the substantial Presence is a continu'd Doctrin from the Apostles.

(32.) H. N. endeavours to avoid the force of these Reasons three ways ; first by five pretended Parities, concerning which he's to be Admonish'd, that Parities are the weakest Arguments, and the most deceitful Solutions of all other, and if they do not hold true in the Point they are alledg'd for, they are none at all.

H. N. §. 46. (33.) The first Parity is taken from the *Tares* in the Parable of the Gospel ; but were they not taken Notice of before they had over-run the whole Field, and turn'd all into *Tares* ? Its manifest they were, otherwise neither cou'd the Servants have propos'd Weeding of them out, nor the Master Reaping of the Field, unless they had all been Mad-men. This Parity therefore holds no Proportion with the substantial Presence, which at *Be-rengarius's* first appearance possess'd the whole Field of the Church, and consequently is Lame, and will do him no Service.

(34.) The

(34.) The second Parity is taken from the *Sadducees Error* concerning their denial of Angels: But had this Error got universal Possession of the Church? Its manifest out of *St. Paul* it had not. Its therefore of no better Speed than the former. *H. N. §. 47. A2. 23. 8.*

(35.) The third Parity is taken from the *Gracians, Circassians, Abisines and Russians* differing in many Things from the Church of *Rome*. But if *H. N.* would have dealt so fairly, as to have distinguish'd whether these Differences he Hints at are Accidental or Essential; Such as only alter Religion in indifferent Practices, or such as overthrow it in fundamental Points; he might have sav'd himself the trouble of roaming so far Abroad for such poor Ware. If he means the former, he says nothing to the purpose; if he means the latter, we can shew him when and by whom they began, and how they were oppos'd. For Example, the Differences concerning the *unity of Person*, and *diversity of Natures in Christ*, by *Nestorius*, and *Eutiches* in the Fifth Age: The Difference concerning the *Procession of the Holy Ghost* by *Photius* in the Ninth Age, &c. *H. N. Ibid.*

(36.) The fourth Parity is taken from Indulgences: But if *H. N. §. 45.* *H. N.* would have spoken distinctly here again, he might have sav'd himself a second Labour, and Bishop *Fisher* the Disgrace of being question'd about the Faith of the Church, for whose Doctrine he both wrote and dy'd. If he speaks of the Power of granting Indulgences, we find no rise of it betwixt us and the *Apostles*; and therefore tho' we had not *St. Paul's* Authority and Example for it in his proceeding with the incestuous *Corinthian*, yet the entire Possession it held of the Church at the time of *Luther's* Defection, assures us sufficiently of the Continuance of it from the *Apostles*. If he speaks of the different use of this Power, practis'd according to the different Exigences of Times and Persons, this is a Matter of Discipline, and consequently indifferent, and not fundamental. The fifth Parity taken from *H. N. §. 47.* *Communion under one Kind* is of the same Nature, and therefore they both are as lame as the rest. None of these shuffling Parities therefore being of any Service to him,

(37.) 2dly, He endeavours to avoid the force of these Reasons *H. N. §. 2.* by an Historical Trace of Transubstantiation, judging it (as he says) the most proper way to set the Matter in a true Light: This is what I must own, at the first Sight look'd very fair. But when I perceiv'd he began his Trace from a Conjuror, and pursu'd it by the suspicious Numbers of 300 to thrice 300 Years, with dreadful Words of Operation of the Devil, Mystery of Iniquity, &c. I was ready to Bless my self, as fearing he was leading me into enchanted Ground, but looking further into the

Matter, I found there was no Witchcraft at all, or Danger in the Undertaking.

H. N. §. 3.

(38.) About the middle of the second Century there was one *Mark* a Conjuror, says *H. N.* Who pretending to Consecrate Cups fill'd with Wine, extended the Words of Consecration to a great length, and made them to appear of a Purple Colour, &c. What's this to the Roman Catholick Form of Consecration, which is perform'd in in those short but divine and powerful Words of our Saviour, *This is my Body, this is the Chalice of my Blood?* What has Wine, under the appearance of Blood, to do with Flesh and Blood under the appearance of Bread and Wine? Unless to make *Mark's* Disciples of Roman Catholicks, *H. N.* has found out a new Logick to Warrant this Consequence. There's Flesh and Blood under the appearance of Bread and Wine by Virtue of the Son of God's Words: Therefore the same are Wine under the appearance of Blood, by Virtue of a Conjuror; He may as reasonably argue thus. The Paper is steep'd in Ink; Therefore its White. The Sun is passing the Meridian Line of our Hemisphere: Therefore 'tis our Midnight. Besides, by what Logick or Magick either, since we are amongst Conjurors, will he make out his Trace through 300 Years by a Race of Conjurors, and then by some new *Circean Cup*, according to *Cicero's* Expression, Inchant them into *Eutichians*? What Marks will he have Recourse to for this? When in arguing Men run to Extravagance, 'tis a dangerous Sign of wilful Obstinacy.

Quæ societas lucis ad tenebras?

Quæ conventio Christi ad Belial? 2. Cor. 6. 15.

Cicer. in Verrem.

H. N. §. 4.

(39.) Next to the Impostor *Mark*, says *H. N.* I find all of Transubstantiation but the Name among some Hereticks of the fifth Age. To which is answer'd, Its well known the *Eutichians*, whom he Hints at, Err'd in this, that they distinguish'd not the Divine and Human Natures in Christ, for which they were condemn'd in the Council of *Chalcedon*: But 'twas never yet heard that any Council or Father condemn'd them upon the account of Transubstantiation: As for the Truth of this Assertion, *H. N.* if he dares believe himself, may satisfy himself. For as certain from

H. N. §. 16.

Erasmus, upon what Ground I cannot tell, He affirms, That it was late before the Church defin'd Transubstantiation unknown to the Ancients both Name and Thing; and in his first Paper he undertakes to prove expressly that Transubstantiation was unknown to Antiquity. How comes he now to change his Dialect, and say, He finds all of Transubstantiation, but the Name among some Hereticks of the fifth Age? He may Contradict himself as much as he thinks good; But I hope he does not expect any Body should believe his Contradictions. He might possibly think his Design of fathering Transubstantiation upon Conjurors and Hereticks would

would make it appear Odious, and create a Disgust against it; in such as would not be attentive enough to take Notice of a *Matchivelian* Principle here Practis'd, of detracting boldly in hopes something of Disgrace would stick, and not all be wip'd off. But then he shou'd have consider'd that ill lay'd Designs always come to nothing, and that Children when they Shout their Arrows at Sun and Moon endanger their own Heads; had he done this, he would have taken more Care of Wounding himself so Shamefully with his own Contradictions. But to clear this Point a little further, without taking Advantage of his Oversights; its one Thing to find the *Roman* Catholick Doctrin in Hereticks, and another to find it in their Heresy. The first is rather an Advantage than a Prejudice, inasmuch as it appears hereby so undeniable, that 'tis own'd even by their Enemies; not as forg'd or invented by them, but as continu'd from the Tradition of a Church, in which they were first Instructed, and from which they are in some other Matters revolted: In this Sense I've already own'd, That the Doctrin of Transubstantiation is to be found in all the Oriental Churches, whether *Nestorian*, *Eutichian*, *Photian*, &c. and this is no more Disgrace to Catholicks, than it is to Protestants to own the Divinity of the Father profess'd by the *Arians*; or the Divinity of the Son profess'd by the *Macedonians*. The second indeed is Disgraceful, because it is to make Transubstantiation and *Eutichianism* the same Thing, which is so far from it, that Mr. *Claude* of *Charenton* held them inconsistent, and thereupon challeng'd the *Eutichian* part of the Eastern Church. From which Challenge they have vindicated themselves in a solemn Declaration in these Words. *Altho' we believe there is but one Nature in Jesus Christ, nevertheless it follows not hence that the Humanity is destroy'd, and that Jesus Christ has no Body. But we believe that the same Body of Jesus Christ that was crucified, that is ascended into Heaven, and sits at the Right Hand of the Father is present really, tho' invisibly, in the Eucharist under the Species and exterior Appearances of Bread and Wine which only remain: Because the Bread and Wine are chang'd into the true Body and true Blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. This is the Doctrin of our Church Catholick, this the Foundation of our Joy and Glory.* Nay, being *H. N.* says expressly afterwards that the *Eutichians* held only something like Transubstantiation, he'll certainly no more undertake to maintain Transubstantiation and *Eutichianism* to be the same; than he'll undertake to maintain the Belief of the Incarnation to be Heathenism, because the Heathens believ'd something like it in *Jupiter's*, *Apollo's* and *Neptune's* Metamorphosis? As for the true Judgment and Sense of *St. Chrysostome*, *Gelasius*, and *Theodore*,

I'll give it him when I come to answer his Objections, I expect out of the Fathers, which will be a proper Time and Place for it.

H. N. §. 9. (40.) The next Step *H. N.* makes in his Trace, is only of about 300 Years more from the *Eutichians* of the fifth Age, to the Fathers of the second *Nicene* Council in the Eighth. But here he's more Moderate, and abates much of his Heat, he does not lay Necromancy to their Charge with his Conjuror *Mark*, nor Heresy with his *Eutichians*; all that he undertakes to prove, is, That they chang'd the current Language of the Church. Indeed, its no wonder that setting out so furiously, he has run himself off his Wind at two Steps, being they are such very large ones, and his Footing so loose and slippery. However, to Humour him since he has a mind to bring this great and important Controversy to a way of speaking; let's see what he gets by't.

H. N. §. 10. (41.) Epiphanius, a Deacon in this second Council of Nice, (says *H. N.*) confidently affirms, That none of the Apostles or Fathers ever call'd the Sacrament an Image of the Body of Christ after Consecration, but his Body and Blood properly. St. John Damascene had said the same before, if *H. N.* had thought convenient to have taken Notice of him; but I suppose he aim'd at what follows; Here, says he, its to be observ'd, That these Establishers of Image Worship first attempted to alter the current Language of the Church for near 800 Years. In answer to which, *H. N.* is desir'd to take Notice, and remember it well (for it will serve for a full Solution of a great many frivolous Objections commonly made out of the Fathers) that the Blessed Eucharist being a Sacrament that consists of Two Parts, one according to St. Irenaus, Heavenly, the other Earthly; one signifying, the other signified; one exterior and visible, the other interior and invisible. According to the Earthly, exterior and visible part it is the Image, Type, and Figure of Christ; according to the Heavenly, interior, and invisible part it is Christ himself: Again, the Words Image, Type, and Figure, have a Two-fold Signification, one Original, the other Vulgar: The original Signification implies no more than a bare Representation. And as an invisible Thing, tho' present may be represented by a visible Image, so it follows not that it is not present because it is represented: So we say, the Eye is the Image of the Soul, tho' we know the Soul is in the Eye. The Dove was the Figure of the Holy Ghost, tho' we know from St. Luke the Holy Ghost was under the corporeal Form of the Dove. The Word Incarnate was the Image of the invisible God, tho' we know from St. Paul the fulness of the Divinity inhabited in him corporeally. The Reason hereof is that the Original

L. 4. cont. H. N.
ref. c. 4.

Luc. 3. 22.

Col. 2. 9.

ginal and Genuine meaning of the Words Image, Type and Figure, having no special regard to the absence or presence of the Thing signify'd, express them indifferently whether present or absent: And to Dispute this is a Madness, contrary to both Faith and Experience. Nevertheless Things figur'd being commonly absent from their Figures, hence is form'd a more vulgar Notion of Figures and Images, as excluding the Things represented and implying their absence. Hence that common saying, made use of by St. Athanasius, *Like is not the same*; and that of Epiphanius, *If the Eucharist be the Image of the Body, it cannot be the Divine Body it self.* Which is a Truth in the vulgar Signification of the Word Image, but an Error in the original Signification. The Reason why the Nicene Fathers took this Expression of Epiphanius in the vulgar Sense, and as such approv'd it, was, because the Constantinopolitan Cabal under Copronimus, about thirty Years before, had call'd the Blessed Eucharist an Image, in comparison to Pictures of our Saviour us'd in the Churches, which represented him as absent, and therefore their Word *Image* might be taken in the vulgar Signification, and upon that account was dangerous. Tho' at the same time they own'd that the Constantinopolitan Cabal, after they had express'd themselves ill, meant well in those following Words, where they say expressly, *It has pleas'd Almighty God, that the Eucharistical Bread, being an Image of his Natural Flesh, be made the Divine Body by the coming of the Holy Ghost.* Therefore the Survivors of the Constantinopolitan Cabal, and their Adherents had no Contest with the Nicene Fathers upon account of the substantial Presence, tho' they oppos'd them vehemently in a Matter of less Importance, the use and religious Respect due to Images, an unquestionable Argument of their Agreement in the former.

(42.) Here I cannot but complain of H. N. for Two Things; H. N. §. 9. first, for foisting in some Words of his own to disguise the Constantinopolitan Doctrin. For what a difference is there between these two Expressions, *It was the Will of Jesus Christ, that the Bread of the Eucharist being the true Image of his Natural Flesh, should be made his Divine Body by the coming of the Holy Ghost*: And these of H. N. which *Bread is the Body of Christ not by Nature, but as an Holy and true Image of his Natural Flesh*? Had he presided over the Constantinopolitan Prelates, he might have taken upon him the Privilege of speaking for them; but coming so long after them, he may with more Decency let them speak for themselves.

(43.) 2dly, I cannot but complain of H. N. for Insinuating H. N. §. 10. that the current Language of the Church for 800 Years, or the common

common way of expressing the Blessed Eucharist, was, by calling it a *Figure of Christ's Body*, and not the *Body of Christ*. Whereas he cannot be Ignorant that all the three Evangelists, St. *Matthew*, St. *Mark*, and St. *Luke*, and after them St. *Paul* in our Saviour's own Words call it precisely his Body, as likewise do the Fathers of all Ages, when they speak of it as to the interiour and principal part, and when there's no danger of being taken Notice of by *Heathens* or *Catechumens*. And as for *Epiphanius*, and the *Nicene* Fathers with him denying it, ought to be call'd an Image in the vulgar Signification, they neither change the current Language of the Church, nor contradict St. *Basil*, or other Fathers, who call it a Figure or Type in the original Signification, any more than *H. N.* would contradict himself, in saying, The Father is greater than the Son, as Man, and he's not greater than the Son, as God.

H. N. §. 13. (44.) After all this Labour in Vain to prove a Change of the current Language, He goes on thus, *Having here seen the first occasion of bringing in Transubstantiation, or the corporal Presence in the Greek Church, &c.* If he means that the Conjuror Mark, or the *Eutichian* Hereticks, or the pretended Change of current Language were the first occasion of this Belief, he has it all yet to prove, if he means those Words of the second *Nicene* Council, (*The Gifts are call'd Types before they are sanctify'd, but after the Consecration they are call'd, are in effect, and are believ'd to be the Body and Blood of Christ*) express the unanimous Belief of those Fathers deriv'd to them, as they say from our Saviour's Words, and the Expressions of their Predecessors, he has hit the Mark: And from the like Words of *Charlemain*, and the Council of *Frankford*, he might have hit it as truly at the same time for the *Latin* Church. But he had first another 300 Years Leap to take in his wonderful Trace before he wou'd stop his Carrier, and come to *Gregory VII.* He tells us a Necromancer, for as he began with a Conjuror, so he's resolv'd to end with a Necromancer, in such an Age, and by such a Man in that Age was the *Doctrin of the corporeal Presence establish'd*, says *H. N.* By a corporeal Presence I suppose he means the same as Transubstantiation, conformably to what he said of the *Greek Church* in the eighth Age newly mention'd. So that there's no necessity of answering what afterwards he intimates, that Transubstantiation was no Matter of Faith before the *Lateran* Council under *Innocent III.* Tho' if there were any necessity of it, 'twould be an easy Thing to shew, that as the Unity in substance of the Son with the Father was the constant Belief of the Church, even from the Apostles, before it was express'd by the Word Con-substantial, so the substantial Change

Change or Transfementation of Bread into our Saviour's Body, and of Wine into his Blood, was her constant Belief, before it was express'd by the Word Transubstantiation, the use of Words being govern'd by Custom.

*Quem penes
arbitrium est
& jus & nor-
ma loquendi.
Hor. Art. Poet.*

(45.) Neither is there any necessity of Answering what is said concerning *Pascasius* being the first Broacher of Transubstantiation, since he has retracted it in these Words. *Tho' Pascasius Innovated in some Expressions, yet he taught many Things inconsistent, &c.* Whatever *Pascasius's* Sentiments were upon this Matter, being I have made no use of his Authority, I shall not here make *H. N.* a Slave to his Word, as he is pleas'd sometime to speak, or oblige him to understand *Pascasius* any other way than he has a Mind. But at the same time he must allow me to take no other notice of *Rabanus Maurus*, and *Bertram's* Opposition against him, than as of a Contest about Expressions and ways of Speaking, as in reality he will find it was, if he looks closely into their Writings; and not an Argument of the change of the Churches Doctrin, concerning the substantial Presence at that time; for supposing, as we may with ground enough, that *Pascasius* held a substantial Presence, observe in these Expressions *Rabanus Maurus* and *Bertram* to hold the same. The Bread is chang'd into the Body of Christ, and Wine into his Blood; who would believe that Bread could be chang'd into the Body of Christ, and Wine into his Blood, if our Saviour did not say it? Since he has created Wine and Bread, and made all Things of nothing, its more easie for him to make one Thing of another, than to create all Things out of nothing. Thus *Rabanus Maurus*. The Bread which is made the Body of Christ, by the Ministry of the Priest, exhibits one thing outwardly, and another to be understood by the Spirit of the Faithful. Exteriously it appears to be Bread as it was before, but we are perswaded it is Interiorly something more Precious, Excellent, Divine and Heavenly, to wit, the Body of Christ. Thus *Bertram*.

H. N. 9. 15.

L. 7. ord. c.

*De corp. &
Sang.*

(46.) When I first perceiv'd *H. N.* undertake an historical Trace of Transubstantiation, in order, as he gravely propos'd, to set the Matter in a true light, I expected he would have shewn by what Person or Persons the profession of it was begun, by whom it was carry'd on, what People it divided from their Pastors, what Pastors from their Bishops, what Countries it embroil'd, or what Liturgies it alter'd: But instead of all or any of these Things, he only picks up three imaginary Dispositions towards it. First, a long Ramblement of a form of Consecration from an old Conjuror, call'd *Mark*. Secondly, A dull headed Error in not distinguishing the divine and human Nature in

P

Christ,

Christ, from an old doating Abbot call'd *Eutiches*. And thirdly, A pretended Innovation in ways of Expression, from *Epiphanius* and *Pascasius*; and immediately without naming any one Transubstantiation-Man beforehand, he points you out the whole *Gracian* Church, in union with their Bishops in the second *Nicene* Council, all Professing it, without mentioning the least Contradiction from so much as one Prelate. And the whole *Latin* Church doing the same in the *Roman* Council under *Gregory VII.* yet he owns the supposition of a Change altogether not only Impossible but Ridiculous. And pray what more has he discover'd in this wonderful Trace?

(47.) Had he begun his Trace from the Omnipotent Son of God, who taking Bread into his Hands, declar'd to his Apostles, What he gave them out of them was his Body: Had he continu'd it through the first Age by the Evangelists *St. Paul* and *St. Ignatius*, who tell us, it was his Body which was deliver'd for them, his Body which suffer'd for our Sins: Had he gone on to the second Age, and inform'd us from *St. Justin*, That by the Power of the Word of God, Bread is made the Flesh of the incarnate Jesus: Had he certify'd us of the same from *St. Cyprian*, *St. Hilary*, *St. Cyril of Jerusalem*, *St. Gregory of Nyssa*, *St. Chrysostome*, *St. Austin*, *St. Leo*, *St. Gregory*, *St. Eloy*, *St. John Damascene*, Fathers of the 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th Ages. Had he thus trac'd us out the descent of Transubstantiation, as I shew'd him the way in the Testimony of our Fore-fathers from Generation to Generation, he had made a trace proper to set the Matter in a true Light, a trace indeed. But to begin with the magical Ramblement of a Conjuror, of which no Man living ever read three Words in any Historian that related it; to jump at once three hundred Years, and there cry it in the Ravery of *Eutiches*, with which even *Mr. Claude* thought it inconsistent; to take a second Jump of another three hundred Years, and there cry it in a pretended change of current Language, and way of Expression of *Epiphanius*; to take a third Jump of another three hundred Years, and there cry it in a mere groundlessly pretended Change of Expression of *Pascasius*; to call this an historical Trace proper to set the Matter in a true light; is what no Man in his Senses can think serious.

H. N. §. 17. (48.) But *H. N.* has a third Objection against the two Reasons alledg'd, A strange Lethargy (no less wonderful than his Historical Trace) of 17000 Sleepers of the tenth and eleventh Centuries, I keep within compass, putting a definite Number for an indefinite, as is usually allow'd, least he should think I speak Hyperbolically. *It was*, says he, *an unhappy Age of profound*

found Ignorance according to Genebrard, an unlearned and obscure Age according to Bellarmine and Baronius, a proper Night for the Enemy to sow Tares, since that Age took little Notice of Things and Recorded less; according to himself. To which is answer'd, That Bellarmine, Genebrard and Baronius, complain only of the tenth Century, to which H. N. who seems resolv'd not to bouge under two or three hundred Years at once, is pleas'd to add the eleventh to double the long Night of Sowing (as he would have them thought) the Tares of the real and substantial Presence, till contrary to the Parable of the Gospel, they had so entirely possess'd the whole Field of the Church, that there was not one Bishop left to speak for poor *Berengarius*. And pray what difference is there betwixt this and what he owns to be Impossible and Ridiculous, that the World should fall asleep *Zuinglianists*, and awake *Roman Catholicks*, without ever mentioning or remembring how it came to pass? What Dose of *Opium*, what deep Drench of *Lethe* had they taken to cast them into so long a Sleep, and such an everlasting Oblivion? *St. Austin* had reason to laugh at the *Scribes and Pharisees*, for taking their proof of our Saviour's Body being stolen out of the Grave, from the sleeping Evidence of a few careless Sentinels; and have not we much more reason to smile at a Controvertists, taking his Proof of a suppos'd change of the Churches Doctrin in an essential Point, from the droulie Evidence of innumerable Bishops, whose very name speaks their Vigilance and Superintendance? Besides, I desire him not to take this Question ill at me, how came he to forget his 19200 Years Sleepers, and a Night of two Centuries long, necessary for the Enemy to sow Tares in the *Greek Church* about 300 Years before?

(49.) But to give a serious Answer to what he's pleas'd, without any appearance of Seriousness to object. Altho' *Italy* during the tenth Age was in sad Confusion upon account of Wars and Contests, among Princes contending for Dominion, and *Rome* it self upon account of unhappy Elections and Debates about the Papacy, the true Reasons of *Genebrards*, *Bellarmines* and *Baronius's* lamentable Complaints; yet *Germany*, *France*, *Spain* and *England* were Govern'd at that time, by worthy Princes and Prelates, as H. N. may see at large in the 8th Tome of *Du Pin*, with whom I perceive he has some Acquaintance; there he may have account of several Councils holden, of several happy Conversions made, and of several learned Bishops, as *Katherine*, *Alton*, *Luitprand*, &c. relating the Discipline and Transactions of that Age in Matters of far less Importance, than the suppos'd change of the Churches Doctrin in so main a point as

that of the blessed Eucharist; which consequently we cannot with any appearance of Reason imagine, they would have let pass in silence had there been any such thing.

(50.) After the Authority of the whole visible Church, for an assur'd continuance of the *Roman* Catholick Belief in this point, I proceed to the Authority of the *Scriptures* for the same. *H. N.* is pleas'd to tell me, *It was here I ought to have begun*; but *Tertullian*, *St. Jerome*, and *St. Austin*, are of a different Opinion, and if *H. N.* will consider the Matter seriously, I doubt not but he will subscribe to them. For having nothing of our Saviour's Writing come to our Hands, we cannot be inform'd of his Doctrine unless by the Ministry of those, whom he Commission'd to impart it to all Nations, and whether they imparted it by Word of Mouth or by Writing, is equally indifferent, and equally depends upon their Credit as to our Acceptance. The Apostles no doubt had Converted great Multitudes of People before *St. Matthew* wrote his Gospel, as *Moses* Govern'd and Instructed the *Israelites* many Years before he wrote the *Pentateuch*, so that it was not their Writings who gave Credit to them, but they who gave Credit to their Writings.

(51.) 'Tis true they gain'd this Credit by their Miracles wrought in confirmation of what they either Preach'd or Wrote, and we being so far remov'd from them in Time and Place, gain an assurance of what their Miracles, their Preaching, their Writings were, from the unanimous Consent of innumerable Wise and Religious Pastors united with their People, who being of different Countries, and as different Interests, we cannot, acting like Men, that is, Reasonably and Justly suspect them of a design'd Combination to deceive us in a Matter of the greatest Importance, nor without such a design'd Combination can we suppose, that Truth being but one, and Imagination and Error various, such an innumerable multitude of Pastors could have concurr'd in the same Sentiments had they been Govern'd by Imagination or Error, and not by Truth deliver'd to them from Generation to Generation without any valuable Contradiction, which if it ever had been, must of necessity have occasion'd Division, and prevented an universal Concurrence and Agreement.

(52.) This is what *St. Austin* tells us, most reasonably tyed him to the Catholick Church, her Authority begun by Miracles, and confirm'd by Antiquity and the Consent of all Nations. This is what satisfy'd him, he held the Truth of the *Scriptures* when he held with her. This is what the Divines call Evidence of her Credibility, her Universality and Perpetuity of Doctrine
never

never chang'd or contradicted by any who pretended to the Name of Christian, but such as have revolted from her. These are the glorious Characters wherewith the divine Providence has distinguished her from all other Sects, and which have establish'd her Credit so firmly, that none but the Wilful and Obstinate, can upon due knowledge hereof, refuse to own her for the true Depository of God's Word, and of the Doctrine of Salvation. She has several other Marks by which she is known, but tho' she had none but these two, nay, tho' she had none but the latter of them, it would be sufficient, according to the learned Bishop of Meaux, to give her an inviolable Authority, upon which we might safely receive from her Hands, all reveal'd Truths written or unwritten, not as the Words of Men, but as *Conf. with Mr. Claude* *Hos. 2. 13.* they are truly the Words of God. 'Tis into this inviolable Authority of the Church, distinguish'd by these secure Marks of her Fidelity, that all our Faith is finally resolv'd. We embrace reveal'd Truths written or unwritten, heard or read, with a sovereign Firmness and Veneration as attested by God himself. But how are we assur'd they are attested by God himself? Because they are handed to us by a Church, bearing such marks of Fidelity, as ascertain the Conveyance to be good, and such as we cannot refuse if we will act like Men, that is, by the Light of Reason and the Rules of Justice, which God Almighty has given us for our Direction.

(53.) Reveal'd Truths therefore have two Respects, one to the Word of God attesting them, and the other to the Authority of the Church, conveying them to us so attested. We believe all the reveal'd Truths contain'd in Scriptures, we believe these particular Truths of Christ's substantial Presence, and the infallibility of the Church contain'd in these Scriptures, *This is my Body, The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against her.* We believe them, I say, with a Firmness and Veneration answerable to the Word of God who attests them. And how are we sure the Word of God attests them? Because the Light of Reason and the Rules of Justice, obliges us to believe that innumerable Wise and Religious Bishops, united with their People of different Countries, and as different Interests, have not purposely combin'd to deceive us in delivering them so attested: And Truth being but one, and Imagination and Error various, they could not without such a Combination have concurr'd in delivering them so attested, had they been govern'd by Imagination and Error, and not by Truth.

(54.) The

2 Pet. 3. 16.
Eph. 4. 14.
1 Tim. 3. 15.

Ep. of Meaux
Conf. with
Mr. Claude.

H. N. §. 33.

(54.) The Authority therefore of the Church does not remove the Scriptures from us, but puts us in a secure possession of them. It prevents not the use, but the abuse of them, least we should deprive them to our own Ruin and Destruction. Least we should be hurried away with every Blast of Doctrine, not having our Bastera to secure us. Least we should suffer Shipwreck of Faith, not having the House of God to shelter us, and her Pillars to hold us by in all the Storms of Error and Division, rais'd by the Enemies of our Salvation.

(55.) Those who throw off this Authority, and persuade People not to rely upon it, fall inevitably into two dreadful Inconveniencies. First, That hereby they render all Christians of what Age soever, who have not Read and Examind the Scriptures, incapable of making an Act of Faith, and then what will become of all that cannot Read? The second, That when a Christian, how Ignorant soever, once reads the Scriptures, he may prefer his own Judgment in the Sense of them, before that of all the Fathers and Councils in the World. To avoid these dreadful Precipices, which manifestly tend to the utter Ruin of all Faith and Union, we believe reveal'd Truths because they are attested by God, and we are assur'd they are attested by God, because the Church sufficiently Authorized by unquestionable Marks of Fidelity, delivers them to us as such. The Word of God is the sole formal Motive of Faith, and our assurance of the Word of God from the Church, is the last disposition to Faith. For there is no more requir'd of our side to believe a reveal'd Truth, than that we are willing to believe, and have such an assurance that it is reveal'd, as we cannot resist acting as Men, that is, Reasonably and Justly. Whereupon God Almighty who never fails in Necessaries, enlightens our Understandings, and fortifies our Wills by his Grace to such a pitch, as is answerable to the sovereign Authority of his divine Word.

(56.) H. N. has two Objections which I have hitherto deferr'd, because they level directly at the Authority of the Church, assuring reveal'd Truths, by her visible and experimental Marks of Fidelity, Universality, and Perpetuity of Doctrine.

(57.) The first is, That as St. Athanasius was to be follow'd against a prevailing Party declaring for Arianism; so Berengarius was to be follow'd against a prevailing Party, declaring for the substantial Presence. To which is answer'd, That Berengarius never had any Council of his side, declaring against the substantial Presence, as St. Athanasius had the unquestionable Councils of

Nice

Nice and Sardica, declaring for Consubstantiality against Ari-
anism.

(58.) The second is, That in *St. Athanasius's Time*, all the *H. N. S. 43.*
World, according to St. Jerome, wonder'd to see it Self Arian.
To which is answer'd, That this Expression of *St. Jerome* is very
ill understood by *H. N.* if from it he thinks, that either the
whole visible Church, or the greater part of her Prelates, fell
into an *Arian* Belief at that time. The occasion of this Ex-
pression, was an extorted Subscription of a considerable part of
the Western Bishops, in the Council of *Ariminum*, to the de-
fective *Sirmian* Creed above mention'd, with some Additions ac-
cording to *Sulpitius Severus*, to secure it from *Arianism*: As
first, That *Arius* and all his Infidelity were expressly Condemn'd,
Secondly, That the Son was declar'd equal with the Father, and
exempt from time and beginning, and with some Anathemas
gather'd out of the Records of the Council, according to *St.*
Jerome, amongst which this was one, *If any one says the Son*
is not Co-eternal with the Father, Anathema to him. The Bishops
in the very same Council had declar'd for the *Nicene* Creed, and
sent their definitive Resolution to the Emperor *Constantius*, de-
siring a dismissal of the Assembly; so that in reality the Faith
of the *Arimine* and *Nicene* Fathers was the same. After which
the Emperor's Agents with much Solicitation obtain'd of some
of the remaining Bishops, a part being gone away, to Subscribe
the Form above-mentioned, which excepting the Orthodox Ad-
ditions, was the *Sirmian* Fathers, not theirs; not heterodox in-
deed but defective, and as the more Zealous fear'd giving occa-
sion to the *Arians* to spread their Venom, having omitted the
term *Consubstantial*, which cut their Throats. Therefore by
some it was term'd *Arian*, not as containing *Arianism*, but as
by an indiscreet Condescension seeming to favour it.

Dial. cont.
Lucifer.

Aug. 27. 43.
2. 2. 43.
43.

(59.) This is the true Reason of *St. Jerome's* Expression, as is
gather'd out of these his own Words. *The Bishops who had been*
caught in the deceitful Snares of Ariminum, and who were taxed
with Heresie, without being in the least Conscious of it, met from all
sides, protesting by the Body of our Lord and all that is Holy in the
Church, that they suspected nothing amiss in their own Faith.
Whence he expostulates with the *Luciferians* in these Words,
Why should they Condemn those who were no Arians? Why should
they divide the Church which remain'd in Agreement of Faith.

Com. in Gal.
3. 2.

(60.) What *St. Jerome* says in regard of the Western Church,
St. Gregory Nazianzen says in regard of the East, upon a like
occasion of omitting the term *Consubstantial*. These are his
Words. *Under a pretence of Reverencing Scripture, and Embrac-*

Orat. in Laud.
ing Ath.

ing only the unexceptionable Words thereof, through doubtfulness of Expression they open'd a Gate to Impiety; and this it was that deceiv'd many of our otherwise invincible Champions of Faith, who tho' they laps'd not in their Judgment, yet transgress'd in their Subscription. Nay, the very Words of St. Jerome alledg'd by H. N. imply as much if rightly understood. For why shou'd the World represented (as he supposes) in those subscribing Bishops wonder to see it self *Arian*, if they had not holden, and profess'd an Orthodox Belief both before and after, and even intended the same at that time, however they fail'd of making a full Profession of it, and were from a Subscription contrary to their own Meaning and Intention charg'd with what they never thought of.

(61.) Hereby it is Evident, That tho' some ancient Writers complain much of the over-flow of *Arianism* at that time, occasion'd as they thought by that Subscription, yet their Complaints, as is natural to Sorrow, are exaggerated. For St. Basil says expressly, That the Universality of Bishops maintain'd the Catholick Faith at that time. And St. Hilary testifies as much at least for the Western Church.

Ep. 75: apud
Socrum. de Sy-
nod.

(62.) Here it may be observ'd, That the first great Effort that the Enemy of Mankind made against Christianity, was to have extinguish'd Christ the Founder of it. The second was to have extinguish'd his Church, the Depository of it, by ten bloody Persecutions. The third was to have extinguish'd the first Principal of it, the Belief of our Saviour's Divinity by several Cabals and Heterodox, or defective Forms. These Efforts were violent indeed, and such as stagger'd the Weak of Courage, and dazzl'd the Weak of Sight.

(63.) But as for the substantial Presence after the Unbelieving *Capharnaï's*, and perhaps some remaining Spawn of them in St. Ignatius's Time, the Devil never rais'd any considerable Opposition against it for a Thousand Years, whether it was that he despair'd of Success, because Christ had so firmly establish'd it by these positive Expressions, *This is my Body which is to be deliver'd for you, my Blood which is to be spile for you; my Flesh is truly Meat, and my Blood is truly Drink: Unless you Eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and Drink his Blood, you shall not have Life in you: Or that he fear'd Christians would be deterr'd by St. Paul's denouncing Judgment upon those who Eat or Drink it unworthily, not discerning the Body of our Lord, or by St. Hilary's declaring the Dis-belief of this, and the Dis-belief of Christs being the true Son of God, are in Effect the same. Whether it were upon these, or any of these Reasons, I say, the Devil never rais'd any considerable Op-*
position

position against the Substantial Presence before *Berengarius's* Time, nor from *Berengarius's* Time till that of *Luther* and *Zuinglius*. Tom. 7. Wip- temb. 1588. demiss. prio. & de univ. Sa- cerd. fol 443. And as for *Luther* indeed he press'd him vehemently in a Mid- night Disputation to attack this reveal'd Truth, as that unhap- py Apostate himself relates, yet prevail'd no further than to make him hold it by way of Impanation, but with *Zuinglius* he had more Success, tho' not so much as to make him keep his Council. For he owns that he had it suggested to him in his Sleep by a Spirit, he did not know whether Black or White, to in- Tom. 2. l. de terpret is in those Words of our Saviour, This is my Body, by subfid. Eub. *signifies*. I hope *H. N.* will not take it ill that I lay open this Disgrace, since he has been so free in his Stories of Conjurers, and Necromancers. What I infer from all this, is, That altho' the Enemy of Mankind rais'd some appearance of a Church for *Arianism*, in the Fourth Century, yet he rais'd none at all for *Berengarianism* in the Eleventh, which makes this Error both more inexcusable and insustainable.

(64.) And to return now to our Resolution of Faith into the Authority of the Church, distinguish'd by the conspicuous and experimental Marks of her Fidelity in delivering reveal'd Truths, its so satisfactory, and withal so necessary, that *H. N.* notwithstanding what he has said in defence of *Arianism*, seems willing to share in it by these Words: *Thus far we are agreed that we take* H. N. §. 54. *the Scriptures for the Word of God, on the Testimony of the Church, and will submit to any Interpretations of the Scriptures made by the Universal Church.* Very good. But let's make a Step further and enquire for whether of these two Motives it is, that *H. N.* admits the Scriptures on the Testimony of the Church? For that she bears in her Universality and Perpetuity the secure Marks of her faithful Deliverance of the Scriptures, or for that the Scriptures declare her Infallible? If the first, his Resolution of Faith agrees with ours, and is very good, if the second, he incurs in- avoidably a Circle, proving Scriptures only from the Infallibility of the Church, and the Infallibility of the Church only from Scriptures. Which is as much as to say he believes the Scrip- tures are the Word of God, because the Church which Attests them to be so is Infallible, and he believes the Church is Infalli- ble, because Scriptures which Attest her to be so are the Word of God. Where each Antecedent is evidently both *Prior* and *Posterior* to the other, and consequently can be no Proof, but a mere wheeling Maze to turn him round in till he loses Sight both of Church and Scripture.

(65.) 'Tis not enough therefore that he tells us here he admits the Scriptures upon the Testimony of the Church unless he de-

clares distinctly, that it is upon the Motive of her Specifick Marks of Fidelity in delivering them, her Universality, Perpetuity, or the like, he's never the nearer, avoiding a Circle and securing himself the Possession of the Scriptures. But if he admits them upon those Motives; then how will he shew in *Berengarius's* Time an Universal Church declaring it as a perpetual uncontradicted Doctrin, that our Saviour's Body and Blood are not really and substantially, but only figuratively, and by Faith in the Blessed Eucharist: And that this was then the Interpretation in the Universal Church in a perpetual Succession of Pastors from our Saviour and his Apostles as to those Words; *This is my Body?*

(66.) Because all the Histories and Monuments of that Age declare directly the contrary, and render his Undertaking such a Task insupportable, therefore *H. N.* flies off again, and is resolv'd to be Refractory to the Universal Church, delivering the Testimony of God concerning the Blessed Eucharist at that time. So that his Submission he has told us of is only a refractory Submission as he says I might foresee. And in this at least he's in the right, for I have found by Experience that there are some Men who will neither acquiesce to the Evidence others offer them, nor to their own forc'd Concessions.

(67.) However, having said thus much in Confirmation of the visible Church's Authority at the time of *Berengarius*, which I made my first Proof of the substantial Presence: In condescendence to my Adversary, I offer'd him another more suitable perhaps to his Inclination: Which is this, That the Scriptures being own'd by him for the Word of God (tho' he cannot prove them so, refusing the Authority of the Church, upon the secure Marks of her Fidelity in delivering them, and consequently they are not certainly so to him) yet being there own'd by him for the Word of God, I argue thus, *ex Concessis*, and *ad Hominem*. From these Scriptures consider'd only in themselves, the substantial Presence follows at least indirectly, first because indisputed Texts evidently Evince it; secondly because disputed Texts make more for it than against it. The first indisputed Text is, That the *Gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church of Christ*, who has promis'd to be with her to the end of the World, and to send her the Holy Ghost to teach her all Truth. The second indisputed Text is, That *Heathen Kings and Nations should be converted to the Church of Christ*.

Mat. 6. 10. &
28. 20.

Joh. 14. 18. &
16. 13.

Mt. 60. 3.

H. N. § 56.

(68.) As to the first Text *H. N.* complains it brings us to a new Controversy, whether the Church of Christ be Infallible, or no, which he says they deny. To which is answer'd, That I'm amaz'd

amaz'd to find *H. N.* is yet Ignorant of what I've been Writing for, and he against, all this while, is not it whether the substantial Presence be to be accepted as a reveal'd Truth upon the Authority of the whole visible Church declaring it such in *Berengarius's* Time? Has not the Infallibility of the Church attest'd by God, and ascertain'd to us; so attest'd by the glorious Marks and Characters of her Universality and Perpetuity resplendent and conspicuous even in *Berengarius's* Time, been hitherto my sole Argument? The Impossibility of Non-complaint of Successors Preaching against their Predecessors, the Impossibility of unknown Changes, and the Testimony of Fathers, being rather Confirmations than new Proofs of the same first and sole Argument. And if I condescend to argue from the same Infallibility own'd at least as I expected, tho' not ascertain'd to such as refuse the Marks of the Church, do I change my Argument? Would he have me to argue without a Proof, and say it is so because it is so? I hope I've given him no Reason to think me so Weak.

(69.) Therefore to return to the Matter in Hand; altho' there seems to be little more necessity of proving the Infallibility of the Church from the Text, *I have built my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against her*, than of proving an Identical Proposition; Yet let me ask these Questions. Was there ever any Time since the Apostles, in which there were no Christians? Or were there ever any Christians, who making a sincere Profession of this Article of their Creed, *I believe the Holy Catholick Church* did not believe there was an Holy Catholick Church? And how could they believe there was an Holy Catholick Church, if Fallible in delivering reveal'd Truths necessary for her Sanctification? I have the Charity to hope there's no serious Christian will affirm any Thing to the contrary. Why then should Protestants deny this Infallibility in their Controversies which they profess in their Creed? If they alledge, as usually, that the Church is only Infallible in Truths necessary to Salvation; Is it not Evident that a true Belief concerning the substantial Presence or Absence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist is of this kind; since *Roman* Catholicks would be guilty of Idolatry according to Protestants in case of his Absence; and Protestants not adoring and receiving him with due Dispositions would be guilty of Impiety according to *St. Austin*, and *Eat In Psalm. 83. and Drink their Judgment, not discerning the Body of our Lord*, according to *St. Paul*, in case of his Presence? Is not the avoiding of Idolatry and Impiety equally necessary to Salvation, and Essential to a true and Holy Church?

H. N. §. 54.

(70.) This Answer therefore not being likely to take with such as really believe their Creed, *H. N.* replies, Secondly, *That the Roman Catholick Church is not the Universal Church, but only a Corrupt Part of it.* To which is answer'd, That he is desir'd to take Notice, that we are Discourfing of the Universal visible Church in *Berengarius's* Time. 'Tis here maintain'd, That during that Time there was no other visible Society of Christians, that bear any appearance of an Universal Church, but what believ'd the substantial Presence, and consequently might have been *Roman Catholicks* as to this Point, had not some of them lost both that Title, and the Title also of being parts of the true Church of Christ, by denying the Unity of his Person in following *Nestorius*, the Distinction of his Divine and Human Natures in following *Eutiches*, or the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son in following *Photius*. If *H. N.* has any other Christian Society to shew of that Time, he's desir'd to specify what Country or Countries they Possess'd, and what Councils they Held, particularly if they design'd any Thing against the substantial Presence.

H. N. §. 58.

L. 4. c. 54. in
Luc. 12.

(71.) 3dly, To avoid, as I suppose, this insupportable Difficulty, he changes Hands; and after having offer'd to extend the Universality of the Church farther than it reaches, he endeavours to contract her into a narrower Compass than she can bear upon that Text of our Saviour calling his Disciples *a little Flock*. To which is answer'd, That they were *a little Flock* in the Sentiments of Humility according to *St. Bede*, and in the Esteem of the World according to their Divine Master. Nay, they were *a little Flock* in Number at that time, in Comparison to what they were afterwards, long before *Berengarius*, when the mortify'd Grain had produc'd much Fruit, when the Sound of the Apostles Preaching had gone over all the World, and the Eternal Father had made good his Promise of giving his Son the Limits of the Earth for the Boundaries of his Possession.

(72.) In fine, *H. N.* not content to make the Universal Church *a little Flock* in a mistaken Sense, makes it yet dwindle into a less, so little that it cannot sometimes be seen, and that by a misunderstood Parity of the Moon. To which is answer'd, That he knows Parities do not run upon four Feet, nor hold in ev'ry Particular, to which ill grounded Judgments sometimes apply them. The Church of God is like the Moon, in that she's now and then Eclips'd by Persecutions, and as it were in a waining Condition by the Defection of Sectaries and Hereticks. But that she, who's call'd *a City* upon a Mountain, and *a Light* plac'd in a Room upon a Candlestick, not only visible in it self, but making

all

all about it visible; that this illustrious and conspicuous Society shou'd sometimes be invisible as the Moon, no more follows than that she's Horn'd like the Moon.

(73.) *H. N.* to shew his Arbitrary Power in Scriptures, fol- H. N. S. 59.
lows the same Method in answering the two Confirmations of my first Text, by extending the Promise of Christ's Presence to all Christians by his Grace without all Reason, and restraining, with as little, his Promise of the Holy Ghost's teaching all Truth only to the Apostles. For how can our Saviour be with ev'ry Particular Christian to the end of the World by his Grace, whilst a great many will turn Graceless and Reprobate before the end of the World? Or with what Reason can we think the Promise of the Holy Ghost's teaching all Truth concern'd only the Apostles, whilst their Successors stand in as much need of the Assistance of the Holy Ghost for the Government of the Church as they did?

(74.) As to the second indisputed Text out of *Isaias*, concern- H. N. S. 61.
ing the Conversions of Heathen Kings and Nations, *H. N.* minces the Matter, saying, *That, and other Prophecies fore-telling the same, receiv'd a remarkable Completion in the Primitive Ages*; as if he would say, if he could for Shame, that all Conversions for above a 1000 Years last past, were false, and not compriz'd in those Prophecies. Which is the Reason why he brings Exceptions against *St. Austin*, *St. Bernard*, and *St. Xaverius*. To make this monstrous Incredibility go down, and Insinuate, that all latter Conversions were not effected by Truth, and Miracles, the necessary Proofs of supernatural Truths with Heathens; but by force and violence, he tells us of the Cruelties the *Spaniards* us'd towards the poor *Americans*. But because they were Cruel in Plundering their Gold, and Invading their Country, were they so likewise in compelling them to embrace *Christianism*? Or has *H. N.* any *Spaniards* in store to Embark with *St. Xaverius* for the *East-Indies*, *Congo*, *Goa*, &c. where both *Christian* Merchants and Missionaries are only admitted upon Courtesy, nay, the latter often Persecuted? What Fleet of *Spaniards* Convoy'd *St. Austin* into *England*? And what Troops of them attended *St. Bernard* to *Toulouse*? As for what he throws wildly about him concerning some new Propositions of a particular Person at present under Examination, its not as it lies in his Paper to be taken Notice of; if he'll draw his Discourse into a well form'd Argument, and shew what he aims at, I'll prepare him an Answer.

(75.) Now because 'tis affirm'd, That Miracles are necessary among Heathens, who know nothing of the Church, or of those conspicuous Marks and Characters which proves her a faithful

Deli-

Deliverer of the Word of God, and because 'tis intimated by St. Bernard's Conversions, that altho' Miracles are rather for the Unfaithful, than for the Faithful, yet God Almighty sometimes makes use of them even for the Latter: Therefore H. N. resolv'd to disown the above-mention'd Conversions, undertakes to disprove the Miracles wrought in order to them, whether by St. Xaverius, St. Bernard, or St. Austin.

H. N. §. 67.

Ep. 38.

(76.) Against those of St. Austin, related by venerable Bede, he objects out of Melchior Canus, that Bede was too easy in writing Miracles upon vulgar Reports. To which is answer'd, First, That Venerable Bede knew better upon what Authority those Reports were grounded, who was a Contemporary with the Persons who reported them, than Canus who liv'd many Hundred Years after. Secondly, What Regards St. Austin, Venerable Bede tells us expressly he had from Albinus Nothelmus, Archbishop Theodore, and the fresh Records of Canterbury. And besides this, we have the Authority of St. Gregory the Great, who declares fully the Miracles of St. Austin in these Words. *I know Almighty God by thy Charity has shewn great Miracles among a Nation chosen by him. So that it is necessary considering so great a Gift, &c.* Thirdly, Neither Canus nor Suarez, alledg'd to the same purpose, deny that St. Austin wrought Miracles in Confirmation of his Doctrin, which is all that I have to defend upon St. Bede's Testimony.

H. N. §. 68.

(77.) Against the Miracles of St. Bernard, related by Godfridus his Companion, H. N. objects, That St. Bernard Apologizes for want of Miracles in his Time, and says, the greatest Miracles he wrought were in the Hearts of Believers, of which he and others were the Blessed Instruments. To which is answer'd, That interior Miracles are no doubt greater according to St. Austin, and much to be prefer'd before those that are exterior; the latter being only in order to the former. But to say St. Bernard affirm'd there were no exterior Miracles in his Time, is to make him Fight with himself, like H. N. For does not he in the Life of St. Malachie, relate several Miracles wrought by that great Saint in the Conversions of the Irish, and in his 24th Epistle to the People of Tolouse, does not he tell them in the Words of St. Paul, that his Preaching of the Gospel to them was not in Word only, but in Power? Therefore the Century-Writers alledge, St. Bernard giving Testimony of his own Miracles, Cent. 12. Col. 1634. lin. 60. and Col. 1649. lin. 40. What St. Bernard in that Place quoted by H. N. says, is not by way of Apology for want of Miracles in his Time, but by way of Answer to this Difficulty, how People then could be said to Believe,

Since

Since none or few wrought Miracles, whereas our Saviour had said, those who Believe in me, shall work Miracles. Where the following Word few correcting the foregoing Word none, argues sufficiently, there were Miracles wrought in his Days, tho' we had not the positive Evidence of Godfridus, the Century-Writers, and St. Bernard himself.

(78.) Against St. Xaverius's Miracles, H. N. quotes Turselin, H. N. §. 65, seeming to Question two of them. But did he only work two, or are those two the Miracles attested by the solemn Declaration of the Portuguese Ambassador taken upon Oath, or those attested by Mr. Hartwell, or Mr. Pory, Protestant Writers? H. N. desires to know when that Declaration was made, and where Mr. Hartwell's and Mr. Pory's Histories are to be found. To which is answer'd, the Declaration was made in the Year mention'd, four Years after St. Xaverius's Death. Mr. Pory's History I have lately seen in the Library of the King's Colledge in Cambridge, and looking for Mr. Hartwell's History in the Library of St. John's Colledge, I found by the Catalogue that 'tis in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. Against these positive Testimonies H. N. alledges negative Arguments of Xaverius, not mentioning his own Miracles himself, and another Writer or two, saying nothing of them. But surely H. N. understands Reason so well, as to know that a Thousand such negative Arguments signify nothing against one that's positive.

(79.) After this H. N. urges that Miracles wrought by our Saviour were foretold by the Prophets, and therefore are to be admitted. But our Saviour himself foretold that after his time there would come false Prophets, counterfeiting Miracles, and therefore posterior Miracles are to be rejected. As if our Saviour had not also foretold that those who believe in him, should work Miracles, or that there are now no Miracles to be allow'd for true, because there have been some only apparent. After this again, he reasons much more strangely, that Miracles are to be tried by Doctrines, and not Doctrines by Miracles. But with due Respect to him, our Saviour and St. Luke are of a different Opinion: Our Saviour saying his Works gave Testimony of him, as Preaching true Doctrine, and St. Luke that our Lord co-operated with his Apostles, and confirm'd their Doctrine by the Miracles which attended it. And if this be, as I may say, the natural Effect of Miracles, will Circumstance of time alter it? Does Reason grow old, or is that which was Wisdom formerly become Folly now? If so H. N. must maintain that the Miracles of the two Witnesses of God, mention'd in the Eleventh of the Apocalyps, will not be worth taking Notice of, The Fire issuing out of their Mouths to destroy their Enemies, their

their foreclosing Rain in the Heavens, and their turning Rivers into Blood, may safely be look'd upon as lying Signs, as impossible as Transubstantiation ; and if *H. N.* lives to that time, it will be well if he value their Doctrin before Antichrist's. He is such an Enemy to Miracles, if they come not at the time he fancies, and answer not the Doctrin he has a Mind to hold ; however they should agree, as certainly they will, with Transubstantiation.

H. N. §. 64.

(80.) If there be Apostolical Men in these latter Ages, *H. N.* desires to know, Why they are sent abroad and do not work their Miracles nearer home, as here in *England, France* or *Germany*? To which is answer'd, That in Christendom where the conspicuous Characters of the visible Church's Universality and Perpetuity appears, there are sufficient means for Conversions, as Experience convinces us there are many, without Miracles ; and those who neglect or frustrate those sufficient Means by Resistance to Truth, and Rebellion to Light, often put an Obstacle to Miracles, as the People about *Nazareth* did to those of the Son of God.

(81.) Besides the proof of exterior Miracles, related by Authors possess'd of Credit and Reputation, against whom no valuable Objection is made ; besides this Proof, I say, of the true Conversions of Heathen Kings and Nations to the Church of Christ, and in it to the belief of Transubstantiation, there is this other of *St. Thomas*, and as *H. N.* owns of *St. Austin*, that for the *Indian* World to have been Converted to the belief of Things so far surpassing their Reason, to do things so difficult and contrary to their natural Inclination ; to hope things so elevated above their Comprehension, either requir'd Miracles, and then these Conversions and the Faith profess'd therein, have the great Seal of God upon them ; or it was effected without Miracles, and then it cannot but be own'd for the greatest Miracle of all. As indeed the supernatural Charity of Missionaries, leaving their Friends and Countries to offer their Blood and Lives to unknown Savages, for the saving of their Souls, and the wonderful Alteration of Life in those Savages Converted, cannot but be look'd upon by those who seriously consider it, as a change of the Hand of the most high and omnipotent God. And consequently tho' interior, yet a miraculous Proof of their true Belief. *H. N.* owns this Argument was good formerly in the Conversion of the *European, Asian* and *African* Heathens, And why is it not good in the *American, Chinese, and Japonian*? He offers no Reason or Disparity, and he is in the right because 'tis impossible to give any-

(82.) To

(82.) To avoid the force of this Argument of Converted H. N. §. 64.
Kings and Nations to the Church of Christ, and in it to the
Belief of Transubstantiation; *H. N.* alledges, That the *Goths*
and *Vandals* were converted to the Belief of Christ by *Arians*.
To which is Answer'd, first, That the *Arians* were no Prote-
stants, nor is it any Honour to *H. N.* to plead so hard as he
does for *Arianisme*. When our Debate is with them, we shall
answer their Pretensions. Secondly, This Conversion being
particular and directly against *Tertullian's* Judgement and
others, its more liable to Exception and Delusion, than so ma-
ny known to have been wrought by *Roman* Catholicks. Third-
ly, That *Gothia* was partly Converted before *Arius's* Time,
Theophilus, a Gothick Bishop, sitting in the first *Nicene* Council,
as *Spondan* proves, and it was fully Converted. together with its
King *Sweno* in the tenth Century, by means of *Otho* the Great.
Lastly, The most ancient Proof of the *Goths* admitting *Aria-
nisme* is taken out of *St. Salvian*, as I find by *Grotius*, and the
Expression from which it is gather'd is doubtful: Whether the
Mixture mention'd of *Arianisme* and *Christianisme*, was in the
Men or in the Doctrin. If *H. N.* can find me the place in *St.*
Salvian, I'll endeavour to give him a more positive An-
swer.

(83.) The disputed Text between Catholicks and Protestants,
is the Words of Institution of the blessed Sacrament. Which
I undertook to shew makes more against the latter than for
them. First, Because the literal Sense expresses a substantial
Presence. Secondly, Because they imply a Testament, which
requires this literal Sense. Thirdly, Because they imply a Law
which requires this literal Sense. Fourthly, Because they im-
ply a Sacrifice which requires this literal Sense.

(84.) *H. N.* objects nothing against the second and third
Reasons, because I believe he would neither think himself fair-
ly dealt with, if an Executor should deliver him only a Map of
a Manor-house and Demesne, instead of the House and Demesne
mention'd, as bequeath'd to him by a Testator; nor would he
think he satisfy'd the Law of Paying the Crown-Tax, if he
paid only a Piece of Lead stamp'd with the Dye of a Crown.

(85.) Against the first Reason he Objects, That it is false H. N. §. 69.
Grammar to say, *Hoc panis est Corpus*, This Bread is a Body,
and it is Tautology to say, *Hoc Corpus est Corpus*, This Body is
a Body. To which is answer'd, That *H. N.* may imagine
Gyants in the Air, and think himself a great Conqueror in de-
feating his own Phantomes. But neither has the Scripture any
such Expression, nor did our Saviour Consecrate, or order his

Priests to Consecrate in those Words, but in these, *Hoc est Corpus meum: This is my Body*, which if Interpreted thus: This thing *Bread* at the beginning of the powerful and operative Consecration, is my *Body* at the conclusion of it, is no false Grammar or Tautology any more than these Words, *Woman thou art clear'd of thine Infirmary*. Where our Saviour does not say *infirm* Woman thou art clear'd of thine Infirmary, nor *sound* Woman thou art clear'd of thy Infirmary: But *Woman* (Infirm at the beginning of the operative Words, and *Sound* at the conclusion of them) *thou art clear'd of thy Infirmary*. If *H. N.* will look into the Testimonies I have cited out of *St. Justin*, *St. Ambrose*, and *St. Gregory of Nyssa*, he will find the ground of this Solution.

H. N. §. 71. (86.) Against the fourth Reason he objects, That *we may partake of Christ's Sacrifice, without Eating of his Sacrifice: Because*, says he, *the Benefit of a Sacrament depends on a Blessing annex'd to the Institution*. But how comes he to pass so slyly from the Sacrifice to a Sacrament? *St. Paul* speaks expressly of the Eucharist, as it is a Sacrifice, and a Sacrifice of our Lord's Body and Blood, which (as his divine Master had taught) was deliver'd and spilt for Remission of Sin and Reconciliation of Mankind to God. He signifies plainly, That to partake of the benefit of this Sacrifice, we must Eat of it as the *Israelites* eat of those of the old Law, that they might partake of the Benefit of them. Now because we could not without natural Abhorrence, Eat of it under that bloody Form, in which it was offer'd upon the Cross; therefore the Son of God instituted it in a clean and unbloody Form, in which it is offer'd all over the Earth, from the Rising to the Setting-Sun; that all his faithful Children, spread over the whole Earth, might partake of it, to the Remission of their Sins, and their Reconciliation to God. We may partake of baptismal Grace in Baptism, without Eating of the Flesh and Drinking of the Blood of our Lord, because it is only a Sacrament; but we cannot partake of the Benefit of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, or *have Life in us unless we Eat the Flesh and Drink the Blood of the Son of Man*, as he Protests most solemnly to us himself, because it is not only a Sacrament but a Sacrifice: And that only Sacrifice which the Son of God offer'd in his Blood for the Remission of Sin, and Reconciliation of Man to God; that only Sacrifice from whence all other Sacraments derive their Virtue, whence it is call'd *Eucharist* by way of Excellence, in comparison to the other Sacraments.

(87.) As

87. As for those Words with which *H. N.* concludes his Objections, *Verily the Flesh profiteth nothing*, I had rather he would *H. N. ibid. Tract. in Jo. 27. and in Ps. 98.* learn the Sense of them from the two *St. Cyrils*, *St. Chrysostome*, or *St. Austin*, than from me: For brevities sake, I give him here *St. Austin's* Interpretation, *O Lord, how does thy Flesh profit nothing, when thou sayst thy self, Unless a Man Eat my Flesh, and Drink my Blood, he shall not have Life in him? Does Life profit nothing? Why then are we what we are, but that we may have Eternal Life, which thou promisest by thy Flesh? What then is the meaning of the Flesh profiteth nothing? It profits nothing as the Capharnaits understood it as torn Piece-meal, or as its Sold in the Shambles; not as its enliven'd with the Spirit. The Flesh profiteth nothing, that is Flesh only, but add Spirit to the Flesh, and it profits very much. If the Flesh profited nothing, the Word would not have been made Flesh, that he might dwell in us. If Christ profited us much by his Flesh, how doth the Flesh profit nothing? The Spirit wrought our Salvation by the Flesh, &c. This needs no Comment.*

(88.) After all this *H. N.* says, *He is confirm'd in his Disbelief of Transubstantiation: To which is answer'd, Non omnium 2 Theff. 3. 2. est fides*, Faith is not the gift of God to all Men: Of which there may be observ'd three Reasons.

(89.) The first is, That some are so blinded with Presumption and Vain-Glory, that they Inspect not or Understand not the true Motives God Almighty has left to direct them to Faith. Hence that Saying of our Saviour to some of the *Jews*, *How Jo. 5. 14. can you believe who accept Glory from one another, and seek not the Glory which is from God alone?* The only Remedy in this case is to clear the Eye of the Soul from those Motes, and to enter into a more close consideration of the above-mention'd Motives, or the like, with all the Zeal for God's Honour and their Soul's Salvation, they are capable of.

(90.) The second Reason is, That *none can come to Christ, except his Heavenly Father draws him*, as our Saviour expressly prefaces before he delivers his Doctrin of the blessed Eucharist. Therefore some after they have discover'd reveal'd Truths by the sure conveyance of them, do not yet embrace them as such in captivating their Understandings in obedience to Faith, because the eternal Father draws them not, by enlightning their Understandings, and fortifying their Wills by his Grace, to such a pitch, as is answerable to the Sovereign Authority of his divine Word: And perhaps their secret Unwillingness to Believe, and Adhæsiion to their own Sense is the cause. The only

ly Advice in this Case is that of St. *Austin*, *To pray they may be Drawn, if they find they are not Drawn.*

(91.) The third Reason is, That some who have both discover'd reveal'd Truths by the sure conveyance of them, and have been solicited, and as it were drawn to Embrace them by the Grace of the Heavenly Father; notwithstanding are rebellious to Light, resist the Holy Ghost, and impugn the known Truth; a Sin against the divine Spirit, which leads them to final Impenitence, and after having confirm'd them here in Disbelief, will establish them hereafter in everlasting Darkness. There is no room for Advice in this Case: For those who will not hearken to the Words of God, will not hearken to the Words of Men. All that we have left for them is our Tears.

T. B.

A

A
VINDICATION
OF
H. N's. ANSWER
TO
T. B's. ARGUMENTS
FOR
TRANSUBSTANTIATION,
Against His
REPLY.

§. 1. **I**N the first Place I observe, That in Answer to my Charge against T. B. for unfaithfulness to his Promise, in detaining his first Paper that I lent him, he here says, *That I willingly consented to his Alteration of it.* Which I T. B. §. 2. declare to be an Egregious Untruth, since all he desir'd was to take a Copy, and both he and Mr. T. promis'd they should be return'd in three Days, as soon as he had Copy'd them, instead of which he never return'd me the same Paper, which I Charge on him as a Breach of Faith, and a far different Thing from sending an Appendix, which I should have receiv'd as Civilly from

from him, as he did mine. I may add that this Matter being debated at our Meeting in *December* last, and I appealing to Mr. T. he very ingenuously declar'd two several times that the Papers were borrow'd only to take a Copy, and he thought T. B. would have return'd the same. And now I come to his Reply, in examining which I shall observe this Method.

1. His unjust Accusations of Me for Mis-quoting or Mistaking of Authors.
2. His frivolous Objecting my Self-Contradictions.
3. Some weak and insufficient Answers, which he returns to my Arguments.
4. Then I will consider what he says to confirm his own.
5. Examine some New Allegations, and
6. Lastly, Take Notice of several very material Passages in the Paper he pretends to Answer, which he hath pass'd by in Silence.

§. 2. I might indeed justly Blame T. B. for confounding the Order of my Discourse in his Reply, that being for no other End, than to obscure the Evidence, which the regular Connection of Things carry'd in it; and the better to delude one, whom he hoped would not be a very curious Examiner of his Management. One Thing I cannot but take Notice of, that when I answer his Argument from Prescription, he pretends in his Reply, that I set my self to Attack it from the Authority of Erasmus. Would not any one think, that I had there brought in Erasmus, an Author of the Sixteenth Century to overthrow his Prescription in the Eleventh? Whereas in that Place I do not say one Word of Erasmus, but casually mention'd him many Pages before: Declaring my Dependence on St. Augustine's Rule about a Prescription, of which he takes no Notice. But this I only Hint at here, as one Instance of T. B's. unfaithfulness in Transposing my Discourse.

T. B. §. 27.

(1.) I begin with T. B's unjust Accusation of Me for false Citations and gross Mistaking of Authors.

§. 3. 1. I had said of the Synod at *Tours*, That *Berengarius* recanted nothing there, but declaring that he did not teach Bread and Wine to be *empty Figures*, he was dismiss'd. Here I am charg'd with putting in *empty Figures*. To which I answer, That I did not pretend to cite the very Words of any Author in that Place, but I had respect to a Passage cited by Archbishop

Ush. de Success. Usher out of Guilmund de Sacram. l. 1. Edit. Lovan. 1551 Panem & vinum in Sacrificio Domini non UMBRATICE sed

vere

vere carnem Christi & sanguinem fieri. And I think that Adverb *Umbratice* imports the same as empty Figures, especially when oppos'd to *Vere*. And yet that is a Form of Confession, that none of our Church would refuse to Subscribe to, as well as *Berengarius*.

§. 4. 2. I cite *Leo Ostiensis*, l. 3. in *Chron. Cassin.* c. 33. as giving an Account of the Synod of Rome under Pope *Nicolas*. T. B's. Reflection on this, is, *Its much that H. N. could crowd so much Mistake into so narrow a Compass; for Leo Ostiensis in the Place cited hath not a Word of Berengarius.* In answer to this Charge I here cite the very Words of *Leo Ostiensis*, *Ejus temporibus* (speaking of *Alberic* the Deacon) *facta est Synodus in urbe Roma contra Berengarium Diaconum Ecclesie Andegavensis, qui inter multa alia, qua astruere nitebatur, sacrificium Corporis & sanguinis Domini figuram esse dicebat. — Eique cum nullus valeret O B S I S T E R E Alberius E V O C A T U R ad Synodum.* I confess, c. 33. is named for c. 35. but so small a Mistake of three for five ought not to have been took Notice of with so much Exultation, by one who is beholding to me for passing by far greater Oversight. When he cites *Aug. on Ps. 88.* for 98. *Chrys. hom. on Matt. 84.* for 82, when he cites Pope *Leo* and *Gregory* without naming any Place, did I say no such Testimony is to be found, to save the trouble of seeking for it? No, I searched after his Testimonies falsey cited, till I found them, and answer'd them. Whereas T. B. takes the advantage of a mistaken Figure to Triumph as if the Passage were forg'd, which was not above two or three Pages off. This was the easiest, let the World judge whether a fair way of answering one that is constrain'd to turn over Volumes to hunt after his false Citations.

§. 5. 3. About the Synod at Rome, under *Gregory VII.* I say, That it appears by the very Acts of that Synod, that many Bishops there were of *Berengarius's* Mind. To this T. B. says, *The Acts of that Council contain no such Thing.* I say they do, and provoke him to the Book cited by me. I grant that *Labbe* says at length they were brought to agree with the rest, but that is not inconsistent with what I said, that they came to that Synod of the same Opinion with *Berengarius*, which shews that the contrary Doctrine was not before generally receiv'd.

§. 6. 4. I cite *Matt. Paris* for saying of the *Lateran Council* that all ended in *Laughter and Mockery*. This, says T. B. I have added on my own Head. But if in *risum & Scommia desit*, may be render'd so, I appeal to *Du Pin de Antiqua Ecclesie disciplina*, p. 572. citing those very Words out of *Matt. Paris*. As is to be seen in *Manchester Library*. And whereas I am charg'd with a grie-

a grievous Mistake for saying this Council was not quoted for above Three Hundred Years after; and T. B. produces several Quotations of that Council within that Space, I have consulted the Places, and find that they cite them only as the Decrees or Constitutions of Pope *Innocent III.* And if he distinguish between a Pope's Decree, and the Canons of a Council, he will find me still in the Right, which I am the more Confident of, because *Du Pin* (cited by me in the Paper T. B. pretends to Answer; but is not took Notice of by him) agrees that no Canons were made by that Council, but some Decrees being fram'd by the Pope alone, and Read in the Council, some of them to the major Part seem'd Burdensome, and so none were Subscrib'd.

T. B. § 20. §. 7. 5. He charges me with want of Sincerity, in relating that the Greek Bishops in the Council at Florence, by cunning Management, were drawn to Subscribe more than they intended, and that no Greek Bishop own'd that Council, except the few that were at it. But that herein I am sincere I appeal to *Du Pin*, Cent. 15. p. 47. and to *Sylv. Scyropulus Historia Consil. Florent.* who was one of the Greek Bishops that was in that Council, both which discover enough totally to invalidate its Authority. I appeal also to *Labbe*, tom. 13. p. 4. that *Græci nunquam hoc Generale Concilium receperunt.*

T. B. § 27. §. 8. 6. I cited *Erasmus* for affirming, That it was late before the Church defin'd Transubstantiation, unknown to the Ancients both Name and Thing. What says T. B. to this? Upon a careful Examination *Erasmus* is found to say no such Thing. I answer. The Words of *Erasmus*, in his Comment on 1 Cor. 7. are these. In Synaxi Transubstantiationem sero definivit Ecclesia (In *Salmeron* is added, *Et re & nomine veteribus ignotam*, then proceeds as in *Erasmus*) *Diu satis erat credere, sive sub pane consecrato, sive quocunque alio modo adesse verum Corpus Christi.* Now I appeal to the Place in my Answer, where I cite this Passage thus. *Eras.* in 1 Cor. 7. citante etiam *Salmerone.* *Erasmus* on the 1 Cor. 7. even as cited by *Salmeron*, and it is entire in the Place of *Salmeron* I cite, and *Et re & nomine veteribus ignotam* in the Book in *Manchester Library* writ in great Letters. If then any do *Erasmus* wrong, it is not I, but *Salmeron*, and its probable that he found them in some Edition of *Erasmus*, tho' here in the Country I do not meet with it. However, what is still Extant in *Erasmus*, amounts to the purpose for which I cited it.

T. B. § 47. §. 9. 7. Concerning what I say about *Mark the Conjurer*, T. B. calls it a *Magical Rabblement of a Conjurer*, of which no Man Living ever Read three Words in any History that relates it. I answer.

swer. If hereby he reflect on the Matter of Fact, I refer him to *Irenæus*, who relates the Story, as also does *Epiphanius*. If he speak only of his Form of Consecration, it is nothing to the purpose: Since whatever Form he us'd, he pretended to make a very strange, if not a substantial Change, for which it was that I mention'd him.

§. 10. 8. About the *Cabal*, as he calls it, at *Constantinople* (a Title the second of *Nice* better deserves) I had said, Those Fathers declar'd the Bread to be the Body of Christ, not by *Nature*, but as an *Holy Image* of his Natural Flesh. He charges me with Mis-representing this Council. But as I did not there pretend to relate the very Words of that Council, but the Sense; so the Words themselves I referr'd to, will vindicate me from Mis-representation. They are these, *ὡςπερ ἐν τῷ καλῷ φύσιν τῷ Χριστῷ σῶμα ἁγίον, ὡς θεοῦ, ὡς δὴλον καὶ τὸ εἶναι, ἢτοι ἢ εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ.* *Labbe tom. 7. p. 448.* *ἀγία, ὡς διὰ τινος ἁγιασμῷ χάρις δεικνύται.* And I appeal to any that understands *Greek*, whether in them Christ's Body καλῷ φύσιν, or his Natural Body be not oppos'd to, and distinguish'd from his Body εἶναι, or the Holy Image of his Body, which is what I had affirm'd.

These are all the Passages I have observ'd, wherein I am charg'd with false Citations, and I am sure ocular Inspection will clear me, and Convince T. B. of Disingenuity.

§. 11. But to vindicate my self from any such Dealing as I meet with, it is fit I here take Notice of a Charge T. B. makes against me: That I say he had insinuated, that *Berengarius* had no Followers: Whereas he had said expressly, he had some Followers, tho' few, Vile and Infamous. Now compare these together, and let the World judge, whether this be not an *Insinuation* that his Followers were none, or next to none, whereas I had prov'd them many, and considerable (of which more hereafter;) and I believe none that read my Paper with Candor, will understand me otherwise.

§. 12. (2.) Now I come to consider the *Self-Contradictions* T. B. charges me with. As—1. That I affirm the Decrees of the Council at *Lateran* were never Publish'd, quoted or took Notice of for above Three Hundred Years after, and yet in the next Paragraph I cite *Matt. Paris* speaking of that Council, who flourish'd from five to thirty five Years after it. And is not this very frivolous? Do I ever seem to doubt, that there was such an Assembly call'd, as the *Lateran Council* by *Innocent III*? Or that Decrees were propos'd by the Pope in it? All I say, is, That the Bishops assented to no Decrees there, and consequently all those Decrees are only the Pope's *Decretals*, and not Decrees of

that Council. If T. B. can prove, That I cite *Matt. Paris* mentioning any Decree of that Council as Authentick, then he proves me to Contradict my self, but not for citing him as representing that for a ridiculous Assembly.

T. B. §. 39. §. 13. 2. T. B. very Critically observes that I say, *All but the Name of Transubstantiation was found among the Eutychians in Theodoret*: And in another Place, *That something like Transubstantiation was found among them*. And where is the Contradiction? There is no Passage in Antiquity for the first six Centuries, that I have yet met with so like Transubstantiation, as what *Theodoret* in the Person of *Eranista* says, and if I affirm the Doctrin of those Hereticks to want only the Name to pass for Transubstantiators, I desire to know, where is the Absurdity, much less Contradiction? While the ancient Orthodox Fathers teach no such Thing, but disclaim it, when started by the *Eutychians*. (a) I am certain the Contradictions, wherewith I charge Transubstantiation are more conspicuous, when T. B. so Magisterially calls on me for a Logical Definition of an *Implicans*. These are all the *Self-Contradictions* I find my self charg'd with, and they are so frivolous, that I may presume my Discourse pretty consistent, or my Adversary not quick-sighted at Contradictions, which in the Doctrin under Debate, he hath inur'd himself to Swallow without Chewing. I proceed

§. 14. (3.) To take Notice of some *Answers* T. B. returns to some Arguments of mine, and (where they do not sufficiently Expose themselves) to lay open their Weakness and Insufficiency.

§. 15. 1. When he had demanded the Name of the first, that broach'd Transubstantiation, I demanded the Name of the first that broach'd the *Sadducees* Error denying Angels and Spirits.

T. B. §. 34. T. B. answers, *But had this Error ever got an universal Possession of the Church? What then? It was an Error, and yet none can*

(a) In another Place, he makes this *Self-Contradiction* to consist in affirming and proving Transubstantiation unknown to the Ancients both Name and Thing, tho' all but the Name was taught by the *Eutychians*. But if it be consider'd that I explain my self, and moderate that first Expression, all but the Name by the latter, something like to Transubstantiation, and that by ancient Fathers I plainly mean the Orthodox, this little Cavil will not appear very material. And I here declare, That I intended no more by all but the Name, but that this was the nearest Transubstantiation of any thing in Antiquity, as favouring the Existence of Accidents without a Subject, but yet in reality it came short of Transubstantiation, since the *Eutychians* could not believe Christ's Body under those Accidents, who believ'd that he had no Human Body: But only a Divine Nature, under the Accidents of an Human Body.

tell

tell us the first Author of it: And consequently Transubstantiation may be an Error, tho' we cannot Name its Author.

§. 16. 2. Again, *Tares* were sow'd in the Field, while the Servants slept, therefore the Servants could not tell, when they were Sown: Hence I inferr'd, *That Heresies may be Sown, and the time when they were first sow'd not known.* No, says *T. B.* the *T. B.* Parity is lame, for the *Tares* did not over-spread the whole Field. But were they not *Tares*? And do not the *Tares* represent Heresies? And may not Heresies then begin undiscernably, as the *Tares* were Sown? Its impossible that an Error should over-spread the Church at first, and his Argument is, that it cannot come in at all, but the first Teacher of it would be taken Notice of. This I disprov'd by the forecited Argument, and *T. B.* in effect now allows, that they came in unobserv'd, but never over-spread the whole Field. That is another Question, and I am sure the *Tares* he contends for, tho' they prevail'd too much, and very much over-top'd the good Corn, yet never over-spread the Universal Church, as I shall hereafter shew.

§. 17. 3. Because I say, the Servants when they slept could not know the time, when the *Tares* were Sown; *T. B.* applies against me St. *Augustine's* Confutation of the Soldiers Testimony of what was done while they slept. Let the World judge whether the little Jest he pretends to make do not turn on them, who, tho' *Tares* are Sown oft while the Servants Sleep, will needs have those Servants that slept to tell who sow'd them, or else they shall be no *Tares*? Whose then is the Absurdity, *Ye that pretend to be Writers of Controversy, and call for Witnesses to Testify what was done while they slept, and could take no Notice?* We say in a sleepy careless Age Errors may spring up, and the first Broachers not be took Notice of. Can we then be charg'd for appealing to sleeping Evidence?

§. 18. 4. When I desire the Names of all that first started all the Errors among the *Grecians*, he distinguishes into *Accidental* and *Essential*, and pretends he can tell the Name of the first Broacher of all *Fundamental* Errors among them, and *Accidental* may come in undiscover'd. This is a mere Evasion, unless he will give us a full Catalogue of Fundamentals, for till then they may pretend all Errors to be only *Accidental*, whose Original cannot be discover'd. Especially since the *Greek* is a traditional Church, and pretends to an assur'd Continuance from Christ and his Apostles: And if they have err'd, so may the Church of *Rome* too. To which add, That the *Grecians* will as firmly deny *Photius*, the first Author of denying the *Filioque*, as we do *Be-*

berengarius to be the first that deny'd the substantial Change in the Eucharist.

§. 19. 5. As to *Indulgences*, I cited Bishop *Fisher* to prove, That the time when *Indulgences* first came in cannot be determin'd, yet its certain there was a time, when they were not us'd. T. B. §. 36. To this T. B. answers, That the Power of granting them was always, tho' the different use of this Power is a Matter of Discipline, and might be various according to the Exigences of Times and Persons. To manifest the Invalidity of this Answer, it need only to be explain'd. No doubt the Power of relaxing Canonical Penances in extraordinary Cases was always in the Church, and was practis'd by St. Paul, as he Hints. But the Power of granting *Indulgences* now is another Thing, having no relation to Canonical Penances, but Purgatory Pains. Here is a new Thing carry'd on under an old Name; which is the Artifice of the Roman Church, when it hath evidently gone off from the old Doctrine, yet to retain the old Name, to impose on the Unwary, and make them think the Thing the same, because the Name was. Tho' then the Power of relaxing Canonical Discipline was alway in the Church, yet Pretence to the Power of relaxing Purgatory Pains (as the Doctrine of Purgatory it self) is a Novelty: And of this Latter Bishop *Fisher* knew not who first introduc'd it.

§. 20. 6. I had said, *Communion in both Kinds* was ancient, and in one Kind an Innovation, yet it cannot be said, in what Age, or in what Parish it first began. T. B's. Answer is, *This is another of the same Nature* (he means a Matter only of Discipline, and in it self Indifferent) and so the Parity lame as the rest. But here I must desire him to consider, whether it be a Matter of Indifference to keep or break an express Command of Christ's illustrated by Apostolical and Primitive Practice, with a Non-obstante both to the one and the other? I say this is no indifferent Matter, and this Parity as all the rest holds good, and consequently are good Arguments, for what they were alledg'd.

T. B. §. 37. §. 21. 7. T. B. objects, That in my Essay, to trace Transubstantiation from its Original, I make such large Steps. I begin with Mark the Conjurer, A. 160. to Hereticks mention'd by St. Chrysostome, A. 390. and Eurychians oppos'd by Theodoret, A. 440. by Pope Gelasius, A. 470. by Ephraim, Patriarch of Antioch, A. 540. and by Facundus, an African Bishop, A. 550. Thence to the Synod at Constantinople, A. 754, and that at Nice, A. 787, to Paschasius, A. 818. and thence to Berengarius's Time in the Eleventh Age. This T. B. calls Conjuraton, and a Progress by Steps.

Steps of Three Hundred Years a-piece. Which makes me fear his Skill in *Arithmetick* is no better, than his Skill in *Law*. Tho' I desire him not to take occasion hence to waste a Page in Praise of *Arithmetick* (as a necessary help to Divinity, without which *Alanus de Rupe* could never have Calculated just how many drops of Blood Christ shed at his Passion, viz. 347500.) as on my Faulting his Acting the Lawyer ill, he does in the Paper I am answering in Praise of *Law*. Besides, it is no Fault of Mine, if the Traces of Transubstantiation lie no thicker, since I have omitted no Particular that occurs in History, as far as my Acquaintance with it reaches: And if I may guess by his vain Attempt in his Jury of Fathers, his profound Learning can find no more.

§. 22. 8. I prove out of *Theodoret*, That *Eranista* the Heretick asserts something like Transubstantiation, viz. That only an appearance of Bread and Wine is left in the Eucharist. *T. B.* answers, *Its one Thing to find the Roman Catholick Doctrin among the Hereticks, and another to find it in their Heresy.* But should he not have took Notice, that the Orthodox Fathers deny it, and consequently that by those Testimonies it appears to have been a part of their Heresy? I hope he will bethink himself better, if ever he set himself to answer those Testimonies out of *St. Chrysostome*, *Theodoret* and *Gelasius*. In the mean time I cannot but admire this Argument of his, that Hereticks owning their Doctrin, proves its assur'd Continuance, when at the same time the Orthodox Fathers deny it.

§. 23. 9. *Epiphanius*, a Deacon in the second Council of *Nice*, says the Sacrament is never call'd an *Image* or *Type* after Consecration. This I affirm'd to be an *Innovation in the Language of the Church*, which never scrupl'd before to call the Eucharist a *Figure*, *Type*, *Antitype* or *Image* after Consecration, as well as before, as is undeniably Evident from *St. Basil's Liturgy*: This *T. B.* answers with an observable Preface. *H. N. is desir'd to take Notice, and remember it well (for it will serve for a full Solution of a great many frivolous Objections commonly made out of the Fathers) that the Blessed Eucharist being a Sacrament consists of two Parts, &c.* All he adds there is very well, till he comes to his Distinction of an *Image*, *Type* and *Figure*, which he says have a *Two-fold Signification*, one *Original*, and the other *Kulgar*. Which Distinction I am sure is much more frivolous than any of our Arguments, and no way capable of solving them. For

§. 24. 1. Our Dispute is not whether the Thing represented must necessarily be absent from the Image or no. For we grant it hath an Indifferency to its Presence or Absence: But whether the

the Image be not one Thing, and that whereof it is an Image an other? Whether the *Earthly* and *Heavenly*, the *invisible* and *visible* Parts in the Eucharist, can be two Parts, and yet the earthly Thing changed into the heavenly, so that none of its Substance remains? Whether *Image* be not a relative term, and whether there must not be a distinction between the *Relatum* and *Correlatum*, the Type and the Archetype?

§. 25. But says T. B. the *Eye is the Image of the Soul*. If it be (which for what I know, is a Notion peculiar to himself) I desire to know whether it be the Soul; or if the whole Substance of the Eye were changed into the Substance of the Soul, it could then be called an Image and not rather the Soul it self? And when St. *Athanasius* says, *No like is the same*, will he allow the Eye the Image of the Soul (in the original signification of the Word) to be the same as the Soul? *The Dove was the Figure of the Holy Ghost*, says he. But was that aerial, corporeal Cloud formed into the Figure of a Dove, the substance of the Holy Ghost? And yet it is a Figure in T. B's original Sense. And when the Son is called the *express Image of the Father's Person* (it is in the Original *ὑπαπόστασις*, not *εἶδος*) I hope T. B. will allow a real personal Distinction between the Father and the Son. And when the Apostle calls *Christ, (God-Man) the Image of the invisible God*, I hope there is a real difference between God manifested in the humane Nature, and God invisible. So that T. B's so useful Distinction does him no good.

§. 26. 2. Much less is it pertinent to the present Occasion. *Epiphanius* says, The Fathers never call the Eucharist *Antitypes* after Consecration. I prove St. *Basil* in his *Liturgy* in express Words, and after Consecration so calls it. The Question is not about the *Sense*, but the *Use* of the Word; and if the Word was used, *Epiphanius* and the worshipful Council of *Nice* were mistaken. I moreover proved, in Vindicating my first Arguments against Transubstantiation, in what Sense the *Greek Fathers* take those Terms, and that in their Sense the *Antitype* and *Archetype* cannot be the same. To which add

§. 27. 3. That tho' Figure, Image, Type or Antitype in their original Signification, have an indifferency to the Presence or Absence of the Archetype; yet in the Case of a Sacrament celebrated in remembrance of Christ, they denote rather the Thing absent which they represent, than make it present. And

Lib. 4. de Sa- here I desire T. B. to take notice of the Words of St. *Ambrose*,
eram. c. 5. in as they are set down by the Author of the Book of Sacraments
initio. under his Name: Where he asks this Question. *Would you know that the Eucharist is Consecrated by heavenly Words? Hear then*

then what the Words are. The Priest says, *Make this Oblation to us Allowable, Rational, Acceptable, which is the Figure of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.* Methinks this Prayer, thus expressed, signifies a great deal for us, and more than all our Adversaries pretend to cite out of those Books against us. And it is observable they were too plain to be continued, when Transubstantiation came to be the Doctrine of the Roman Church; so that in the present Canon of the Mass, instead of *figura Corporis*, they now read *fiat nobis Corpus*, &c. So that here we have, what T. B. calls for, a change of the Liturgy of the Latin Church upon this change in Doctrine. Lastly, The Fathers make the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist to be Signs and Symboles of Christ as Absent, and so take the Words in T. B's vulgar Sense. (a) St. Ambrose says, *Here is the Shadow, here is the Image, there (in Heaven) is the Truth.* (a) L. de Offic. c. 48. The Shadow is in the Law, the Image in the Gospel, the Truth in Heaven. (b) Again, *Ascend, O Man, into Heaven and thou shalt see those Things, of which there was here only a Shadow or Image.* (b) in Psal. 38. And (c) Theodoret after his coming there will be no more need of Symboles of his Body, when the Body it self appears. (c) in 1 Cor. 1. 26. I need to add no more but what I find in (d) Bertram, which will at once prove him to be on our side in this Controversie, and a great change in the Liturgy since his time, as also that Image is taken in the vulgar Sense as T. B. expresses it. (d) Bert. Edit. ult. Lond. 1688. p. 235. s. 85. His Words are these: *In the Prayer used after the Mystery of Christ's Body and Blood, to which the People, say, Amen, the Priest speaks thus, We who have now receiv'd the Pledge of Eternal Life, most humbly beseech thee to grant, That we may be manifestly made Partakers of that, which here we receive under an Image.* On which Bertram thus Comments. *A Pledge and Image are a Pledge and Image of somewhat else; that is, they do not respect themselves, but another Thing. It is the Pledge of that Thing for which it is given, the Image of the Thing it represents. They signify the Thing whereof they are the Pledge or Image, but are not the very Thing it self: Whence it appears, That this Body and Blood of Christ, are the Pledge and Image of something to come, which is now only represented, but shall hereafter be plainly exhibited. Now if it only signifie at present, what shall be hereafter really exhibited, then it is one thing which is now Celebrated, and another which shall be hereafter Manifested.* Then he cites another Prayer, which is (tho' the former be not now extant in the ordinary Mass-book) *Let thy Sacrament work in us, O Lord we beseech thee, those Things which they contain, that we may really be made Partakers of those Things, which now we celebrate in a Figure.* On which
Bertram

P. 239. §. 88. *Bertram* thus Comments. *He saith that these Things are celebrated in a Figure, not in Truth; that is, by way of Representation and not the Manifestation of the Thing itself. Now the Figure and the Truth are very different Things. Therefore that Body and Blood of Christ, which is celebrated in the Church, differs from the Body and Blood of Christ, which is Glorified. That Body is the Pledge or Figure, but this the very Truth it self; the former we celebrate till we come to the latter, and when we come to the latter the former shall be done away.—— We see then how vast a difference there is between the Mystery of Christ's Body and Blood, which the Faithful now receive in the Church, and that Body which was born of the Virgin Mary, which Suffered, was Buried, Rose again, Ascended into Heaven and sitteth at the right Hand of God. For the Body, which is celebrated here in our way, must be spiritually Received; for Faith believeth somewhat that it seeth not, and it spiritually feeds the Soul, makes glad the Heart, and confers eternal Life and Incorruption; if we attend not to that which feeds the Body, which is chewed with our Teeth and ground to Pieces, but to that which is spiritually received by Faith. Now that Body in which Christ Suffered and Rose again, was his own proper Body, which he assumed of the Virgin, which might be seen and felt after his Resurrection, &c.*

Ibid. §. 89.

§. 28. And by this time I hope *T. B.* is sensible of the Imperitinnence of his Distinction, since *Image* in his original Sense is a thing distinct from what it represents, and the *Fathers* use it in his vulgar Sense, as representing something absent. I desire him also to observe, That there hath been a change in the *Liturgy* of the *Western Church* since *Transubstantiation* came in, as appears both from *St. Ambrose* and *Bertram*; and withal to consider, whether he can without forfeiting all Modesty, claim *Bertram* for a Witness of the present Popish Doctrin, after he hath Read what I have transcribed out of him. I proceed.

§. 29. (4.) To review *T. B.*'s Glosses on his former Arguments in this Paper, and consider all he suggests that is material for the confirmation of them. From the Condemnation of *Berengarius* in the eleventh Age, he concludes, That then *Transubstantiation* was the Opinion of the universal Church, and thence infers its assured continuance from Christ and his Apostles. In reviewing this Argument, I shall have occasion to consider all that *T. B.* says for it, by enquiring into and clearing these Particulars.

L. Whe-

1. Whether in the eleventh Century and downward to the Reformation, Transubstantiation was the Doctrine of the whole Church? Whether the whole Field was overspread by those Tares?
2. What a generation of Men that Faction in the Church was, among whom it then prevail'd?
3. Whether other Errours and Heresies have not prevail'd as much as Transubstantiation then did?

§. 30. (1. For the first, I am most concerned for the *English Church*, and shall therefore produce my Proofs in the first place, that she kept her ground, and was not tainted with this prevailing Errour. In my answer to *T. B's* first Paper, I mention'd two Canons for Burning the remainder of the Eucharist, one *A. 700.* and the other *970.* whence we may conclude of those times that they believed not Transubstantiation. And this is one material Passage in that Paper, which *T. B.* in his last pretended Answer takes no Notice of.

§. 31. I shall next produce the *Saxon Homily*, which he scorns as a *Nameless Manuscript*: And if that will please him better, that it hath a *Name* and is in *Print*, I can oblige him in both. It is a *Saxon Easter-Sermon*, the Author *Elfrick* Abbot of *Malmesbury*. It was Publish'd with an *English Translation* by *John Day*, in the last Age. It is to be found in *Fox's Martyrology*, Vol. 2. p. 580. Edit. ult. It hath also been set forth with a *Latin Translation* by the Learned *Abraham Whelock*, in his *Saxon Edition* of *Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, p. 462. Camb. 1644. The Manuscript also is extant in the *Publick Library* in *Cambridge*, and is above Six Hundred Years old, and so lights about the time of our present Enquiry. Now in this *Homily* are undeniable Testimonies against Transubstantiation, some few of which I will Transcribe.

“ Men have often disputed, and do it still, how that Bread
 “ which is prepared of Corn, and is baked by the Heat of Fire,
 “ and that Wine, &c.—can be changed into Christ's Body
 “ and Blood. To such I answer, some things are spoken of
 “ Christ by signification, some others by a known thing. It is
 “ a true thing and known that Christ was born of a Virgin,
 “ voluntarily suffered Death, &c.—He is called Bread, and a
 “ Lamb and a Lyon, and otherwise by Signification. Bread
 “ because he is our Life and the Life of Angels, a Lamb for
 “ his Innocence, a Lyon for his Strength,—yet according to
 T “ true

" true Nature, Christ is neither Bread, nor a Lamb, nor a Ly-
 " on. Why then is the holy Eucharist called Christ's Body and
 " Blood, if it be not truly what it is called? Truly the
 " Bread and Wine which are Consecrated by the Mass of the
 " Priests, shew one Thing outwardly to Men's Senses, and an-
 " other thing they declare inwardly to believing Minds. Out-
 " wordly Bread and Wine are seen both in Appearance and in
 " Taste, yet they are truly after Consecration Christ's Body
 " and Blood by a spiritual Sacrament.—*This then he explains*
 " *by the Change made in an Heathen Baptism, and in the Font Wa-*
 " *ter by Consecration, and then proceeds thus.*—There is a
 " great difference between the invisible Virtue and Power of
 " this holy Eucharist, and the visible appearance of its proper
 " Nature. By its Nature it is corruptible Bread and corrupti-
 " ble Wine, and by the Virtue of the divine Word it is truly
 " the Body and Blood of Christ; yet not Corporally so, but
 " Spiritually. There is much difference between that Body
 " which Christ suffered in, and that Body which is consecrated
 " for the Eucharist. The Body that Christ suffered in, was
 " born of the Flesh of *Mary*, with Blood and Bones, with
 " Skin and Nerves, animated by a rational Spirit in human
 " Members: But his spiritual Body, which we call the Eucha-
 " rist, is collected from many Grains of Corn without Blood
 " and Bone, without Member or Soul; wherefore there is no-
 " thing in it to be understood Corporally, but all is to be under-
 " stood Spiritually.—Therefore the holy Eucharist is cal-
 " led a Sacrament, because one thing is there seen and another
 " thing understood; that which is there seen hath a bodily Na-
 " ture, that which we understand in it hath a spiritual Virtue.
 " The Body of Christ, which suffered Death and rose from the
 " Dead, henceforth Dies no more, but is Eternal and Impassi-
 " ble. That Eucharist is Temporary, not Eternal; it is cor-
 " ruptible and capable of Division into Minute Parts; it is
 " chewed with the Teeth, and sent into the Draught: Yet it
 " will be true, that according to spiritual Virtue it is whole
 " in every part.—Tho' some receive a lesser part of it, yet
 " there will not be more Virtue in the greater part than in
 " the lesser, because it will be whole in all Men according to
 " the invisible Virtue. This Sacrament is a Pledge and a
 " Type (and in the vulgar Sense too) the Body of Christ is
 " the Truth. We keep this Pledge sacramentally, till we
 " come to the Truth it self, and then is the Pledge at an
 " end.—

§. 32. There is more in this Sermon to the same purpose, but this is enough to shew, that the Language and Belief of the Church of *England* then was the same that it is now, in the matter of the Eucharist. For this Homily was appointed to be Read publickly to the People on *Easter-day*, before they received the Communion; and therefore is to be looked on, not as the Opinion of a private Man, but as the Doctrin of the whole *English Church*. There are two other remains of the same Author to be met with in the place above cited, that speak as plainly the same Doctrin, the one an Epistle to *Wulffine*, Bishop of *Sbyrburn*, and the other an Epistle to *Wolffstane*, Archbishop of *York*; which I forbear to transcribe, and refer *T. B.* to for his more ample Conviction. Thus then the People of *England* were taught to believe toward the end of the *tenth*, and beginning of the *eleventh Century*. And therefore when *Berengarius* stood up for this Doctrin, *Matthew of Westminster* (a) says, That the *English, Italians, and almost all the French*, readily entertained what he delivered. Before I leave *England* (a) *Flor. Hist.* let me observe, That *Wickliffe* and his Followers continued to maintain our Doctrin, and that *Walsingham* in the thirteenth An. 1087. Century, in Ric. 2. says, *The Lords and Nobles of the Land favoured Wickliffe*. Which shew that even then Transubstanti- omnes Gallos Italos & Anglos suis jam pene corruperat pravitatibus.

§. 33. It may not be improper here to take notice of the Christians of *St. Thomas*, inhabiting the Mountains of *Malabar* in the *East-Indies*, whose Opinion about the Eucharist we have from the Censure of their publick Offices and other Books, in a Synod celebrated among them 1599. by *Dom. Alexio de Menezes*, Archbishop of *Goa*. Full view of Eucha. p. 115.

§. 34. In the fourteenth Decree of the third Action of the said Synod, most of their *Church-Offices* and other Books are Condemned, for contradicting the *Roman Faith* in the point of Transubstantion. Particularly the Book of *Timothy the Patriarch*, for asserting through three Chapters, That the true Body of *Christ our Lord* is not in the Sacrament of the Altar, but only the Figure of his Body. The Book of *Homilies* is condemn'd for Teaching, That the Holy Eucharist is only the Image of *Christ*, and the Image of a Man is distinguished from a real Man; and that the Body of *Christ* is not there but in Heaven. For the same Assertion, the Book of the Exposition of the Gospel is Condemned. Their *Breviary*, which they call *Iludre* and *Gaza* is Condemned, which Teaches, That the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, is not the true Body of *Christ*. Lastly, the Office of the Burial of Priests is Condemned for saying, That the holy Sacrament of the

the Altar is no more but the *Virtue of Christ*, and not his true Body and Blood. This Synod was Printed in the University of *Conimbra*, with the Licenses of the Inquisition and Ordinary *A. D.* 1606. And hence it appears, That these Christians, being formerly out of the reach of *Romish* Contagion, continued to deny the substantial Change in the Eucharist till the Year 1599. and consequently were of the same Opinion with *Berengarius* in the eleventh Century. So that here is one little Corner of the Field not over-run with those Tares.

§. 35. And now I come to enquire into the *Greek Church*, that it was on our side for the first six hundred Years, in my Account of Antiquity in my former Paper hath been clearly Demonstrated; but whether they were degenerated with the Church of *Rome* from the eleventh Century downward, is now to be enquired into.

T. B. §. 4.
and §. 38.

Forbesa consi-
der. modest.
p. 397 to 411.

§. 36. T. B. says it is put out of Dispute by Dr. Potter, p. 225. What a lame Citation is here, to Name an Author without the Title of the Book? When I hear what Dr. Potter he means, and in what Book, I will look after it. Is it not strange that he who cites *Cicero* in *Verrem* with so much Formality and Ostentation, only to countenance the Phrase of being *Inchanted with a Circean Cup*, should in a Matter of far greater moment shew so little care? He cites also *Forbes de Eucharistia*, l. 1. c. 3. as proving the same, which I have Read over and find nothing in that Chapter about the *Greeks*, but the Testimonies of St. *Chrysostome*, *Theodoret* and *Ephraim Antioch.* to prove the Substance of the Bread not changed. So that I conclude T. B. still depends upon *Notes*, and is not at the Pains to consult the Authors he cites. A rare way without Pains to make a Noise with Authors whose Names fill up his Pages, tho' he know nothing of them.

T. B. Ibid.
Alger de Sa-
eram. l. 2. c. 1.
in Bibl. Patr.
tom. 6.
Append. Misc.
opus. 7. p. 564
Hac Epistola
Sapius edita fu-
it Gr. & Lat.
Primum Pra-
ga Ex Biblio-
theca Caroli
quarti per Con-
ciliarium Max-
imilianum; secun-
di Casparum
Hydruck.

§. 37. But we Protestants, he says, are unable to produce so much as one authentick Attestation to the contrary. In answer to this Challenge, I will offer him one or two. *Alger* (an Author of the eleventh Century) upbraids the *Greeks* for holding, that a Man breaks his Fast by the Eucharist, which was to make it real Meat; for which he upbraids them as *Stercoranists*. And if *Alger* do not slander them, the *Greeks* were then no Transubstantiators. *Ludovicus Cellotius* is large in charging the *Greeks* with *Stercoranism*, and cites this Passage of *Alger* for it.

§. 38. Besides there is an *Epistle* from the *Constantinopolitan Church* to the *Bohemians*, written two Years before the taking of *Constantinople* by the *Turks*, *A.* 1451. subscribed by *Gennadius*, afterward Patriarch, by *Ignatius* and *Acacius*, Metro-

Metropolitans, and divers others: In which they thus Salute them.

§. 39. "The Holy Church of *Constantinople*, the Mother and
"Mistress of all the Orthodox.——To all beyond the Moun-
"tains, and all the Orthodox, and sincere Professors of the
"Truth of Jesus Christ ——The Holy Spouse of the Heaven-
"ly Bridegroom, who is the Head of the Universal Church,
"cannot take greater Pleasure, than to hear of her Children
"(viz. the *Bohemians*) walking in the Truth. When therefore
"the Number and Increase of them that suffer for the *Verity of*
"the true Faith, came to our Ears by our Brother, and Son of
"our Church, *Constantinus Angelicus* the Bearer hereof, by whom
"we are certify'd, that ye attend no *Innovations* against the
"Church of Christ made by some, but are settl'd in the Foun-
"dation of our Faith, deliver'd to us by our Lord, and his Dis-
"ciples. Thereupon our Holy Church decreed forthwith to
"Write to you, and to Exhort you to have an Union together
"with her, not like that Union at Florence (*ἡ ἐν ἑσθῆνι*) pro-
"cur'd Corruptly, which ought rather to be call'd a Separation
"from the Truth (wherefore we by no Means admitted it, nay,
"utterly disannull'd it) but according to that fix'd and unchange-
"able Decree, wherein alone we can be truly and safely united,
"and the Church of God doubts not from what she hath gladly
"heard of you, that since you have oppos'd the dangerous Inno-
"vations of Rome, you are in all Things of the same Mind
"with her, by the Mediation of the Holy Scripture the true Judge.
"Tho' before we had a dubious Report of you, as if you did
"not resist the *Roman Innovations*, but rather for the most part
"withstood the Traditions of the Universal Church of Christi-
"ans; yet of Late we are certify'd that you are recover'd, and
"come to the common Religion of Christians: As this devout
"Priest hath signify'd to us more fully, and given us your Pro-
"fession of Faith fully made and receiv'd, and hath receiv'd the
"Doctrin of the true Faith deliver'd to him, in which all ought
"to agree. Therefore beloved Brethren and Sons, if it be thus
"as we hear and hope, make all haste to Unite with us. For
"with whom can you better emulate and strive against the Tem-
"pters, than in the Bosom of the true Mother, and under the
"Protection of true Salvation.

§. 40. Now in the *History of the Bohemian Persecution* we find, Cap. 18.
that by the consent of all the *Bohemians*, an Appeal was made to
the *Greek Church*, and Ambassadors sent to *Constantinople*, to give
the

the *Greeks* an account of all their Doctrins: Who having heard them, and rejoycing in the mutual Consent, writ this Epistle to them, to confirm them in their Faith against the *Innovations of the Church of Rome*, and the Epistle at large *T. B.* may see in *Manchester Library*. And hence these Remarks are obvious.

§. 41. 1. That this is an Epistle not of one single Person, but of the whole Church of *Constantinople*. — 2. That the Eucharist was the Matter principally in Debate between the *Bohemians* and the Church of *Rome*. — 3. Whatsoever was their Doctrin about that, or any other Fundamental without any appearance of the least Exception, they are pronounc'd Catholick, and admitted with all Alacrity into the Communion of the *Grecian Church*, which could not be Ignorant, that they deny'd Transubstantiation, for which the Church of *Rome* (against whom they Appeal) had condemn'd them publickly in the Council of *Constance*. So that this is one of those Doctrins, which they approve of in the *Bohemians*, for holding against the *Innovations of the Church of Rome*, and in which they pronounce them Sound and Orthodox.

§. 42. The Patriarch *Jeremiah's* Censure of the Divines of *Wittenburgh*, I have not yet been able to procure, but I find that *Paget* in his *Christianography*, fol. 59. and *Monsieur Claude*, in his Answer to Mr. *Arnold*, affirm, That he there pronounces it Blaspemy to assert, That *Christ when he first Consecrated Bread and Wine did give the Flesh that he carry'd about him for Meat, or his Blood to drink to the Apostles*. Which is as good Evidence as all *T. B's* second-hand Citations of Authors, whom he never saw, as I am perswaded he never did this.

Its certain *Cyrillus Lucaris*, and the prevailing Part of the *Greek Church* in that Time, till the murdering Projects of the *Jesuits* got him strangl'd, were of our side: And its only the *Latinophrones* among them, that now hold Transubstantiation: Who are bought by those of the *Romish Communion* to say as they do. But that this is a Novelty among them is evident from these two Arguments.

§. 43. 1. That the Generality of them know not what Transubstantiation is. For as Sir *Geo. Wheeler* in his Account of his Voyage thither observes, they wonder that any Man should think them such Beasts as to believe such an Absurdity: When he represented the *Romish Doctrin* to them.

§. 44. 2. Those Moderns, that in Compliance with the Church of *Rome*, under *Cyrril of Berrhea*, condemn'd the Confession of *Cyrillus Lucaris*, have so far out-done their Masters, that one may reasonably conclude, they did not well understand what they did.

For

For in the Synod held under Cyrill of *Borthea*, the Bishops *Ana-Fa. Simons C.* thematiz'd these Words of the 17th Article of *Cyrril Lucaris's Hist. P. 44.* Confession, *What is seen with the Eyes, and receiv'd in the Sacrament, is not the Body of our Lord.* And the Synod under *Parthe-* *mius* on the same Article, makes the same Determination, *That that which is seen, receiv'd, broken, and which hath been already Sanctify'd and Bless'd is the Lord's Body.* With this compare the Determination of the Church of *Rome* in her *Catech. Ad Pa- De Eueb. §.* *rochos.* where, explaining those Words, *Mysterium fidei*, they say, 24.

Mysterium fidei, non rei veritatem excludit, sed quod occulte latet atque ab oculorum sensu remotissimum est, certa fide credendum esse significat. What *Novices* then were those *Greeks*? How little were they acquainted with the Doctrin of the Church of *Rome*, who, resolv'd to please them that had hired them, so far overdo their Business as to Anathematize their *Masters*? For they Anathematize all that say, *That is not the Body of Christ, which is seen with our Eyes.* And therefore the Church of *Rome* among the rest, that say, the *Body of Christ is most remote from the Sense of Sight*.

§. 45. So that in *England*, in *Malabar*, and in *Greece*, I have found some Parts of the *Christian Church* not over-run with the Tares of *Transubstantiation* when that Doctrin prevail'd in the *Romish Church*: To *T. B's.* Negative Argument from the Silence of the *Greeks*, when *Berengarius* was run down in the Eleventh Age, of which they could not be Ignorant, having at that time a Controversie with the *Latines* about Unleaven'd Bread; I answer, that tho' the *Greeks* had Resolution enough to maintain their old Controversies with the *Latines*, yet they were in no Condition to begin a new one, and in Prudence with-held themselves from intermeddling with the *Latines* in this Matter, which was not their Concern. If *T. B.* desire a more ample Answer, he may meet with it in Mr. *Claude* against *Arnold*, and as he had his Argument from this latter, he may take his Answer from the former.

Claude Carb.
Doct. of the
Eueb. L. 4.
C. 2.

§. 46. (2.) What a Generation of Men that Faction in the Church was, which prevail'd in the Eleventh Century? And tho' *T. B.* take Notice of it, as if it were a Mistake, that in my former Paper I give the Character of the Tenth, instead of the Eleventh Age, yet I think it very fit to consider the Character of the preceding Ages, wherein these Tares were Sown, as well as that after Age, when they prevail'd, and almost quite overshadow'd the good Corn. Now to avoid Tedioufness, I will content my self with one or two Testimonies, among many others, to be found collected both by Bishop *Usher*, *de Success. & Statu Eccl.*

Bar. Annal.
Tom. 10. An.
900.

Eccl. c. 2, 3. and by Bishop Tillotson in his Rule of Faith against J. S. Sect. 7. Sect. 3. Pag. 2, 3. I begin with Baronius, *What was then (says he) the Face of the Roman Church? How deform'd? When Whores, no less Powerful than Vile, bore the chief sway at Rome, and at their Pleasure chang'd Sees, appointed Bishops, and (which it is horrible to mention) did thrust into St. Peter's See their own Gallants, false Popes, who would not have been mention'd in the Catalogue of the Roman Popes, but only for the more Distinct recording of so long a Succession of Time.*—Christ was then (it seems) in a very deep Sleep. — And which was worse, when the Lord was thus asleep, there were no Disciples to awaken him, being themselves all fast asleep. What kind of Cardinals, Presbyters and Deacons can we think were chosen by these Monsters, when nothing is so Natural, as for every one to Propagate his own Likeness?

T. B. 48.

Here by the way T. B. may observe, That this pretty Jest (for I believe he took it for one) of his 17000 Sleepers reflects upon Baronius, as well as H. N.

Cress. exomolog. c. 68.

§. 47. I had intended more Testimonies in succeeding Ages, but that Mr. Cressley hath sav'd me that Labour who acknowledges, That these worst of Times of the Church, when Ignorance, Pride, Worldliness, Tyranny, &c. reign'd with so much Scope, when the Popes (so wicked, so abominable, in their Lives) enjoy'd so unlimited a Power; even over secular Princes themselves, and much more over the Clergy; he acknowledges, I say, That these worst Times continu'd during the space of Six Ages before Luther.

§. 48. Hence I may infer, That the Character of these Ages, wherein we say Transubstantiation began, grew gradually, and at length prevail'd, was in the Clergy, Pride, Ambition, and abominable Wickedness, and in the People gross Ignorance and Superstition. And what Probability is there, that lewd Women, and their favourite Popes, Cardinals and Bishops, that were so careless of their own Souls, should concern themselves to prevent Errors, that might endanger the Salvation of others?

§. 49. How unlikely is it, That a Clergy ambitious of Dominion over secular Princes, should endeavour to stifle, and not rather do all they could to promote Doctrin, that was so likely a Means to draw the People to a greater Veneration of them, as allowing the Priest such an extraordinary Power of making his God?

How likely were the People (so prodigiously Ignorant, and consequently Superstitious) to receive the grossest Absurdities under the notion of Mysteries?

§. 50. Here's

§. 50. Here's a Doctrin so fitted to the Humour of the Ages it was receiv'd and improv'd in, that supposing it once asserted, whether by Chance, or out of Design, it was sure to take like Wild-Fire.

Nor is it reasonable to suppose, That the Holy Ghost would preside in the Synods or Councils of Men, so profligate and wicked as the Clergy then were, to render their Determinations infallible. For the very Promise made by Christ, Excludes such from all Claim to it. *If ye Love me (says our Blessed Saviour) Jo. 14. 15, keep my Commandments, and I will pray the Father, and he shall 16, 17. give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the World cannot receive.* Here is indeed a Promise of the Spirit of Truth, but it is made only to those that Love God, and keep his Commandments, and flatly deny'd to all such, as the Scripture Stiles the World, i. e. as the Antithesis gives us plainly to understand, wicked and worldly Men, *That do not Love God, nor keep his Commandments.* Now there can be no Certainty, that any Councils in their Decrees about Transubstantiation were infallible, unless the Bishops in those Councils, and the Popes in Confirming them, had the Spirit of Truth. And our Saviour assures us, That such worldly Men cannot receive it, nor any, but such as *Love God, and keep his Commandments.* So that to expect us to believe such Bishops, and such a Pope as *Hildebrand* (a Sorcerer, an Adulterer, one that no Popish Writer, I ever met with, speaks of without Indignation, except *T. B.* who sticks not to compare him to Christ, and *Athanasius*) to be Infallible, is so unreasonable that nothing can be more, except Transubstantiation. And I see it no way unreasonable or immodest to say, that such Spiritual Guides were to be trusted no farther than generally we do *Rogues we suspect will Cheat us* (as *T. B.* Expresses it) *no farther than we can see.* T. B. §. 23.

§. 51. Before I proceed, I will here subjoyn an Argument or two extorted by *T. B's* repeated Challenges, to produce one Bishop in or about the Eleventh Century, that held the same Opinion with *Berengarius*, which to Oblige him, I thus put into Form.

§. 52. 1. He is a *Berengarian*, that approves of *Berengarius's* Doctrin. A Bishop in or near the Eleventh Century, approv'd of *Berengarius's* Doctrin, Ergo, he was a *Berengarian*. The Minor is thus prov'd. A Bishop that applauded *Berengarius* after his Death for his profound Skill in Divinity, without the least Hint of his Heterodoxy, that pronounces him Sav'd, and wishes to be in his State, tho' he dy'd in the Opinion he had once recanted,

canted, such a Bishop approv'd of *Berengarius's* Doctrin: But there was such a Bishop, &c. *Ergo Min. Hildebertus Cenomanensis*, was a Bishop of the Eleventh Century, or thereabouts, He applauded *Berengarius* after his Death, &c. tho' he dy'd in the Profession of the Doctrin he had once recanted. *Ergo*, The Min. appears from *Hildebertus* Epitaph, the first Verse of the second Distick, *Quam sacra fidei fastigia summa tenentem*, &c. and the last Distick, *Post obitum vivam secum, precor ac requiscam, Nec fiat melior sors mea sorte sua*. Here *Hildebert* applauds him for his great Skill in Divinity, and wishes to be in his State after his Death. And this Epitaph was written after his Death, and after he had retracted his Recantation. For this I have the Testimony of *Lanfranc*, on whom *T. B.* relies principally for all he says of *Berengarius*, and the Testimony of *Bertoldus* in *Baronius*, who both flourish'd at the same time with *Berengarius*: And if they say true as to that Matter of Fact, *Hildebertus* could not be ignorant of it, who was Bishop of *Tours*, and *Berengarius* dy'd in *Turaine*, in *Insula Cosma*.

§. 53. 2. A Doctrin taught publickly in *England*, in a Sermon authoriz'd for publick Use, was approv'd of by the Bishops of the Church of *England*. But the same Doctrin that *Berengarius* taught, was taught publickly in *England*, &c. in or about the Eleventh Century. *Ergo*, This appears from the *Saxon Easter-Homily* above cited, to which add two Arguments more. And now I proceed to enquire

Bar. ad An.
1035.

§. 54. Arg. 3. *Bruno* was a Bishop of the Eleventh Century, he was a *Berengarian*, *Ergo Min.* prov'd out of *Baronius*, who says, *Bruno*, Bishop of *Anjou*, assisted *Berengarius*, whom he had not only drawn into the same Madness by the spreading of his Error, but also found him a zealous Patron and Defender.

Fascic. rerum
Expet. p. 75.

§. 55. Arg. 4. *Gregory VII.* was a Bishop of the Eleventh Century, and he lies under vehement Suspicions of being a *Berengarian*, *Ergo Min.* *Bruno* says, That he wavering in the Faith, caus'd a Three Days Fast to be kept by his Cardinals, to beg of God some Sign from Heaven, to declare whether the Church of *Rome*, or *Berengarius* were in the right Opinion, touching the Body of *Jesus Christ* in the Eucharist. Now could he and his Cardinals have the Doctrin of the substantial Change by assur'd Continuance from *Christ* and his Apostles, and yet be so doubtful as to need a Sign from Heaven to decide the Controversie? To which add, That the Abbot of *Ursberg* and *Aventine* relate, that Thirty Bishops and Lords being Assembled at *Brixia Nomica* depos'd this *Gregory*, among other Things, for being a Disciple of *Berengarius*.

Ad An. 1080.

§. 56. (3.) Whe-

§. 56. 3. Whether other Errours and Heresies have not or may not hereafter prevail as much in the Church, as Transubstantiation did in the eleventh and succeeding Ages? In which Enquiry I shall

1. Lay down the Case of the Chiliafts in Justin Martyr's Time.
2. Review the Case of the Arians debated in my former and T. B's last Paper, and
3. Lastly, Remind T. B. what will be the State of the Church in the Reign of Antichrist, according to the Opinion of the Romish Doctors.

§. 57. 1. Justin Martyr in Answer to Trypho's Question, whether the Christians did believe that Jerusalem should be rebuilt, &c. Thus says, *I my self and as many Christians as are thoroughly of the right Perswasion, do both know that there shall be a Resurrection of the Flesh, and a Thousand Years in Jerusalem, which shall be Built, Adorned and Enlarged.* And whoever reads that Discourse cannot but see, that Justin Martyr declares this to be a divine Doctrin, and owned to be such by all sound Christians. Whence I conclude this Errour of the Millenium, which laid claim to assur'd Continuance from the Apostles, was as prevalent in Justin Martyr's Time as Transubstantiation in the Eleventh Age.

Dial. cum Tryph. Edit. Lutet. p. 306.

§. 58. 2. As to Arianism, I will first produce the account we have of its prevalence; then consider what T. B. says to extenuate it; and lastly draw some proper Conclusions from the whole.

§. 59. 1. As to the first, I begin with St. Hierom who in his Chron. To. ad An. 363. says, *Liberius Bishop of Rome turned Arian, and that Arianism was Established by the Synod of Ariminum, which was a Council more general than any in the eleventh Age, or that of Trent. And ad An. 364. That almost all the Churches in the whole World, under the Names of Peace and of the Emperor, were polluted by Communion with the Arians. And Adver. Lucif. that under the Emperor Constantius (Eusebius and Hiperius being Consuls) Infidelity was subscribed under the Names of Unity and Faith. That the whole World Groaned and Wondered to see it self turned Arian: Exhorting the Luciferians to receive them into the Church who had been defiled with Arianism, because the number of those that had kept themselves Orthodox, was so exceeding small. For (says he) the Synod of Nice, which consisted of above Three hundred Bishops, received eight*

Arian Bishops, whom they might have cast out without any great loss to the Church. I wonder then how some, and those the Followers of the Nicene Faith, can think that three Confessors (viz. Athanasius, Hilarius, Eusebius,) ought not to do that in case of Necessity for the Good and Safety of the whole World, which so many and excellent Persons did voluntarily. Whence it appears, that Arianism had prevailed very far, when St. Hierome could not name above three eminent Persons in the Church, that had kept themselves untainted. To which add what the same Author says in *Epist. ad Gal. l. 3.* Arius in Alexandria was at first but one Spark; but because it was not presently extinguished, it brake out into a Flame, which devoured the whole World. Vincentius

(a) Comenta-
rii. l. 1. c. 4.

(a) confesses that the Poison of the Arians had contaminated not only some certain Portions, but almost the whole World. The Author of Nazianzen's Life, testifies, That the Heresie of Arius had possessed in a manner the whole extent of the World. And what says T. B. to this? Why? This is ill understood by H. N. if he think either the whole visible World, or the greater part of her Prelates fell into an Arian Belief at that time. And who can understand it otherwise, when St. Hierome can name but three eminent Men in the Church, that remained untainted? But says T. B. S. 58. T. B. it was only so said by reason of an extorted Subscription of a considerable Part of the Western Bishops, in the Council of Ariminum, to the defective Sirmian Creed: Which afterwards he calls not Heterodox indeed, but Defective. To all this I oppose St. Hierome's Authority, who declares it to be Arianism; and no body sure will blame us for preferring his Authority. In the mean time who pleads for Arianism now? Do I say a Word in its favour? And yet T. B. charges me with Patronizing it. What Character then does he deserve, who minces the Matter so much in their favour, as to call what St. Hierome and the Orthodox in that Age accused as Heretical, not an Heterodox but only a defective Creed? Suppose after the Council of Trent hath determined the Modes of the Change in the Eucharist, another Council should determine the Matter only in general terms, by a change of the Bread into the Body of Christ, and leave out Substance: Would not T. B. think this defective Creed made in favour of Protestants, an Heretical Creed? And had not the Fathers the same reason to declare against the Subscribers to the Sirmian Creed, as Arians: Who omitted that Term which cut their Throats? Were not the greater part of the Bishops in those Councils Arians, that prevailed over and managed the rest that meant better? However T. B. is resolved they shall be Orthodox; only a little weak in Subscribing contrary

trary to their own Meaning and Intention. But if Fathers in a Council more general than that at *Trent*, may do so, what Reason is there for all the World to submit to them as Infallible? What Reason can there be to own the Council of *Lateran*, to whose Decrees the Bishops would not Subscribe at all? But lastly, All these Complaints of the prevalence of *Arianism*, says T. B. are exaggerated, as is natural to Men in Sorrow: For St. Basil and St. Hilary declare the contrary, That at that time the Universality of Bishops maintained the Catholick Faith. I answer, If Men in Sorrow can Exaggerate, Men to serve a Turn can Hyperbolize. And I see more Reason to think T. B's Boasts of the whole Church against *Berengarius*, an Hyperbole; than St. Hierome's Complaints of *Arianism* an Exaggeration. But what shall we say to St. Basil? I must request T. B. to reprove those that collect Notes for him, and by their carelessness so much expose him. For whereas he quotes St. Basil, Ep. 75. *apud* Sozom. I cannot in all Sozomen's nine Books find any such Epistle; I think, I have Reason to complain of my Adversary for such blind Citations. And for the future I will not trouble myself to search for his Testimonies, that are so generally cited without mentioning what Book; much less what Edition it is to be found in. As to St. Hilary de Synod, Du Pin begins thus, *Ecl. Hist.* His Book of Synods is addressed to the Bishops of France and *Brittain*. And allowing them not tainted with *Arianism*, it might have been as Universal as the Contagion of Transubstantiation in *Berengarius's* Time, when *Brittain* and a great part of France was untainted. For Du Pin tells us, That all the Bishops of France did not continue stedfast, *Saturninus*, Bishop of *Arles*, drawing all that were in the Synod of *Beziers* (A. 356.) after St. Hilary's Banishment to comply with the *Arians*. Again, St. Hilary writ that Tract before the Council of *Ariminum*, in which St. Hierome says (as above cited) *Arianism* was established, and the Contagion by that time was spread farther; and perhaps after that Council St. Hilary would have been as severe in his Censures as St. Hierome. (a) Lastly, St. Hilary makes *Arianism* as prevalent in the Oriental Church, as St. Hierome does, that the Orthodox Faith is hard to be found either among the Priests or the People. I proceed then from this prevalence of *Arianism*.

S. 60. 3. To make my Conclusions to the present purpose: That the paucity of Adherents is no sure Note of Error. I desire T. B. to consult *Theodoret*, wherein he may read a Dialogue between *Constantius* the Emperor, and Pope *Liberius*, (before his Apostacy) wherein the Emperor objecting the paucity of his

his Followers in comparison of the *Arians*; he answers for himself (and remember it was a Pope, and before his Apostacy had confuted his Infallibility.) *There was a time when there were but three opposed the Decree of the King, and yet those three were in the Right, and the rest in the Wrong.* Let *T. B.* also consider *Gregory Nazianzen*, where are they that reproach us with our Paucity, who define their Church by Multitude, and despise the little Flock? (Sure *H. N.* is not to be blamed for supposing the Church may be a little Flock, who speaks the Language of this Father?) They (as he proceeds) *have the People, but we the Faith.* I desire him also to read the Treatise *St. Athanasius* writ on purpose against those, that judge of the Truth only by plurality of Adherents, in defence of himself when overborn by Sholes and Floods of *Arians*: And then he must (if he will be just) conclude the prevailing Party in the eleventh Age, no better an Argument for Transubstantiation, than the prevalence of *Arianism* for Two Hundred Sixty Six Years (as (b) *Joh. Abbas* hath calculated it) is for it. And while he is boasting so much of Numbers, let us know what he says to their own *Salmeron*, affirming, That the latter Doctors are more Quick-sighted than the former, and therefore Pronounces of many of them at once, That *we must not follow a Multitude to deviate from the Truth.*

(b) *Chron. ad*
Octavum an.
Mauritii.
In Ep. ad Rom.
c. 5. disp. 1.
p. 468.

§. 61. 3. Let it be considered, Whether *T. B.* and those he follows, be not storing up Arguments for Antichrist against he come, whereby he will be able to prove his Followers the true Church. For then Popish Writers confess, that the true Church shall be *the Woman driven into the Wilderness.*

Du Pin. ant. 4.
p. 262.

§. 62. And now before I proceed to *T. B.*'s Argument, I will consider what he offers about the Council of *Sirmium*. I will not dispute with him about the number of Councils held there, nor whether they were several Councils or several Conventions of one and the same Council, interrupted by the Troubles of the Empire. It will be sufficient to observe, That of the three Creeds (for I find no more) composed there, the first was Orthodox, the second Blasphemous, and the third Defective. And this Account is confirmed by *Du Pin*. For I desire to know why the Laity was not bound as much to submit to the second Creed, as to any Council in *Berengarius's* time. Is not a Council Infalible in its Determinations, whether the Pope confirm it or no, according to the Decrees of *Constance* and *Basil*? Does it not overthrow the Infallibility of Councils, to allow this second Creed at *Sirmium*, to contradict the *Nicene*? What must the poor Laity do? Would it be consistent with the Rules of Mode-
sty

sty and rational Obedience, for them to pretend to judge of Councils to oppose the present Determinations of the Church, on pretence of former contrary Decrees? But *Du Pin*, says *Li-Tom. 2. p. 62.* *Liberius*, consented to an Heretical Confession of Faith, whether it were the second or third Confession of *Sirmium*, is disputed among the Learned. The Notes on *Du Pin* in that Place make it clear, that in his Banishment, by the perswasion of *Demophilus* Bishop of that City, to which he was Banish'd, he subscribed the heretical *Sirmian* Creed before he came to *Sirmium*, and when he came there, subscribed that which *T. B.* softens with the term of *Defective* only. This is certain, That *St. Hilary* reciting the Words of *Liberius* professing his sincere Agreement to that Faith which had been Expounded at *Sirmium*, breaks off thrice to Anathematise him for his *Arian* Perfidiousness: Concluding thus, *I Anathematize thee again, and this the Hilar. Fragm. third Time, O thou Prevaricator Liberius.*

§. 63. So that I may conclude, that an heretical Confession of Faith was made at *Sirmium*, and subscribed by the Pope: And that either this must be entertained by the Christian Church as true, or a Council confirm'd by a Pope may Err. Where then is *T. B.*'s Rule of Faith? Or why may not I refuse to submit to those Councils in the eleventh Age, that condemn'd *Berengarius*, as *T. B.* to those in the fourth Age, that condemn'd *Athanasius*? And to pretend (as *T. B.*) that was sufficiently secured by the Council of *Nice* before, is only to tell the World that General Councils may contradict one another, which can be no good Character of an infallible Judge. And this is the reason I before mentioned only the *Sirmium* Council in general, because whatever Confession *Liberius* subscribed, is by *St. Hilary* declared Heretical, which is sufficient to overthrow the Infallibility of Councils. And indeed Papists treat Councils with no more Respect than other Men, if they serve not their turn. For it is usual in their Editions of Councils, to have some Printed with this Title, *Reprobatum* (i. e. Disallowed) Others *ex parte Reprobatum*, (i. e. partly approved) according as they agree with their Opinions and Interests at *Rome*, which verifies that smart Censure of *Ludovicus Vives*, That those are accounted Decrees and In August de Councils which make for their purpose, and all others are no more va- civ. Dei li. 20. lu'd by them, than the Metting of some tatling Women in a Weaving- c. 36. Shop or at the Bath. Why then should *T. B.* take it ill, that we give no more deference to his Councils in the eleventh Age, than which none can be more deservedly contemptible, not only for the Qualifications of the Men, but also for the Absurdity of their Decrees. To manifest which, I shall sum up this Debate.

Debate about Councils, with some Propositions of Dr. More's against Monsieur Maimbourg's Maxims.

1. That which in itself is False, cannot by any Declarations of Synods be made True.
2. Whatever is plainly Repugnant to what is True, is certainly False.
3. Whatever is False can be no due Article of a true Faith or Religion.
4. The Senses rightly circumstantiated are true Judges of their proper Objects, whether it be Earth, Fire or Water.
5. An Essence or Being, that is one, so long as it remains so, as it is distinct from all others, so it is indivisible or inseparable from it self.
6. The Whole is bigger than a Part, and the Part is lesser than the Whole.
7. In every Division, tho' the Parts agree with the Whole, yet they disagree among themselves, so that the part A. is not the part B. nor can each Part be truly and adequately the Whole.
8. The same Body cannot be actually a *Cube* and a *Globe* at the same time.
9. No Revelation, the revealing whereof, or the manner of the revealing whereof, is repugnant to divine Attributes, can be from God.
10. No Tradition of any such Revelation can be true, for as much as the Revelation it self is impossible.
11. No Interpretation of any divine Revelation, that is repugnant to rightly circumstantiated Sense and pure unprejudiced Reason, whether it be from a private or publick Hand, can be any Inspiration from God.
12. No Body can be bigger or less than it self.
13. That individual Body, which is already and does not cease to be, cannot be made while it is already existing.
14. One and the same Body cannot be both present with it self, and many Thousand Miles absent from it self at once.
15. One and the same Body cannot be shut up in a Box, and free to walk and run in the Fields, and to Ascend up into the very Heavens at the same time.
16. It is impossible that a Man should swallow down his whole self, into I know not what of himself.

§. 64. These

§. 64. These are common Notions, against which no synodical Decisions are to be admitted; and all *T. B's* cry of Councils from the eleventh Century downward, in the matter of Transubstantiation being contrary to these, are all Nullities, and ought to be looked on by all Mankind as so many Cabals of impudent Impostors. Those Synods that have made Decisions contrary to common Sense and Reason, must certainly be fallible. And such are all those that have defined Transubstantiation, as are abundantly proved in my Arguments against it. And here I am content to join Issue, and bring the Matter into this short compass. *Whether synodical Decisions against common Sense and Reason can be Infallible? And whether the synodical Determinations for Transubstantiation be not against Sense and Reason?*

§. 65. Upon *T. B's* Appeal for the Laity, what they must do in the eleventh Age, when *Berengarius* was Condemned; I asked whether they must believe according to the form in which *Berengarius* recanted, prescribed by Pope *Nicolas*? Must they believe that the Body of Christ is not only truly, but (*sensualiter*) sensibly Handled and Broken by the Priest, and Ground by the Teeth of the Faithful? To this *T. B.* answers, *That this Form hath* T. B. §. 24. *no more Error in it, than in St. Chrysostome's Rhetorical Expressions, That Christ suffers himself not only to be Seen, but Touched, Eaten, and our Teeth to be fixed in his Flesh. But is this Passage of St. Chrysostome literally true? Or must a synodical Decision be taken figuratively? Yes says T. B. If Christ could say to the infirm Woman, Who touched me? when she only touched his Cloaths: Why might not Cardinal Humbert, why may not we say, Christ's Body is Seen, Touched, Broken and Ground by the Teeth of the Faithful, when the accidental Species which contain it, and as it were invest it, are Seen, Touched and Broken; the Divine Body, tho' Immortal and Indivisible in itself, accompanying every Particle as oft as the Species is divided? To this I answer,—*
1. That tho' it might be said of the Woman that touched Christ's Cloaths, *who touched me?* Yet if she had torn his Coat, he could not with any propriety have said, *Why dost thou break my Body?* Or if she had bit out a Piece of his Garment, *Why dost thou grind my Body in thy Teeth?* It would be unjust to charge one that touches your Cloaths, with breaking your Bones, and wounding your Body.—And unless *T. B.* make use of the Wind-mill at *Worms*, I know not how he will make out the grinding of Christ's Body by biting his Garments: Or where he will light of an Engine to grind bare Accidents.—2. That *Semeca* in his Gloss on the Canon-Law, says, *Berengarius* (*ibi* X *Hypers*

In c. utrum sub Hyperbolice locutus est & veritatem excessit) spake there Hyperbolically and exceeded the Truth. No says *T. B.* as literally

figura. 72. and properly as the Woman is said to touch Christ when she touched his Cloaths, in which is no Hyperbole at all.—3. *Du-*

Dur. 4. Sent. dist. 10. 9. 13. *randus* saith, In his time there were Catholick Doctors who taught the Bread remained in the Eucharist, and proved it by

this Confession which *Berengarius* was forced to make, and not Condemned by the Church. Not having it seems learned to understand the Nonsense of one Body cloathed in the Accidents of another.—4. To understand this Recantation of *the Species*

is absurd, because *Berengarius's* Opinion related to the Substance of Christ's Body, which he denied to be in the Sacrament. And

what would it have signified for him to have said that Christ was sensibly Broken and Eaten under the Species of Bread and

Wine? *i. e.* That his Body was not sensibly Broken and Eaten, but the Species were? He had said something if they had made

him declare, That there was no Substance of Bread and Wine left, but only the Species.—5. How is this consistent with

what I have cited above, out of the *Catech. ad Parochos*, which affirms the Body of Christ most remote from our Senses, and

yet the poor Laity by the Decision of a Council, must believe, that it is *seen sensibly*; and if *T. B's* be the true Sense of that

Form of Recantation, what service was this synodical Decision to the Laity, which is made in as obscure terms as the Scripture

it self is by *Papists* supposed to be? Determinations of Councils are to explain Scripture plainly and clearly, and not as this does

to interpret *ignotum per ignotius*; and to rise up into the Clouds on the Wings of an *Hyperbole*, which is allowable in an *Orator*

as *St. Chrysostome* was, but not in a Council's Definitions. Lastly, Let *T. B.* compare this form of Recantation with what I find

in *St. Augustine's* descanting on those Words, *This is the Word*

Aug. Tract. 25. in Joan. of God, that they believe in him whom he hath sent; this, says he, is to Eat the Bread, not which perisheth, but which abideth to eternal Life. Why dost thou prepare thy Teeth and thy Belly, believe and thou hast Eaten. Little did this Father dream of the use

of Teeth *T. B.* hath found out to grind Species and Accidents with.

§. 66. Another Argument by which I overthrew *T. B's* Appeal, was the Contradictions of one Council to another. What must

the Laity do, when *Constance* and *Basil* decree one thing, and

Florence the quite contrary? What a wise Answer does *T. B.* return to it? The Council of *Basil* and *Florence* never decreed

the Pope's Non-primacy. I wonder how these two Councils came to be joined, as decreeing the same thing, when one contradicted

ed

T. B. §. 21.

ed the other. It is also somewhat hard to know what he means by decreeing *Non-Primacy*. But to proceed, *What Deference* (says T. B.) a Pope may owe to a Lawful General Council, and the Decrees of it, H. N. may leave to our Catholick Divines to Dispute among themselves. Alas! this is a sore Place, and he fears a Protestant will handle it too roughly. But (says he) whatever it be, it no more Prejudices the Pope's Primacy, than the Deference our Kings owe to the Laws made by their Parliaments, which they are Sworn at their Coronation to observe, prejudices the Primacy of our Kings in their Temporal Government. This is all T. B's Answer. In return to which I have these Things to offer.

§. 67. 1. The Council of *Basil*, Sess. 33. declares these three Catholick Truths, as Consequences of the Decrees of the fourth and fifth Session of that Council.

1. The Truth of the Power of a General Council, representing the Universal Church, over the Pope, and every other Person, declar'd by the General Council of *Constance*, and this of *Basil*, is a Truth of the Catholick Faith, (therefore, say I) not a civil Controversy, like that about the Power of Kings and Parliaments.

2. This Truth, That the Pope hath no Authority to Dissolve, to Prorogue or Translate from one Place to another a General Council, without the Consent thereof, is a Truth of the Catholick Faith.

3. He is to be esteem'd an Heretick, who does pertinaciously oppose the two foresaid Truths.

§. 68. 2. *Leo X.* not enduring these Curbs, put by those two Councils on the Papal Jurisdiction, disannulls all by his decretal Epistle dated 1516. and confirm'd, as *Binnus* says, by the Approbation of the *Lateran Council*, declaring, *That because it was necessary that all Christ's Faithful People should be Subject to the Bishop of Rome, tho' some of his Predecessors the Popes of Rome—did seem to Tolerate it, yet he can no longer with a safe Conscience desist from a total Extirpation of this wicked Sanction.*—And then declares, That what the Council had done was of no Force, because the Pope having Authority over all Councils, hath full Right and Power of Assembling, Translating and Dissolving them. And then concludes, *That if any one shall presume to infringe these Letters of Declaration, Revocation and Annulation, he shall incur the Indignation of Almighty God, and the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.*

§. 69. 3. Let T. B. tell me what a poor Laick must do in this Case? Whether he must venture the Censure of an Heretick by the Council of *Basil* for owning the Power of a Pope above a Council, or the Indignation of God, and St. Peter and Paul denounc'd

nounc'd by *Leo* and the *Lateran* Council against those that own the Power of Councils above the Pope? If the Belief of a Council's Power above the Pope be an Heresy, did not Heresy prevail as much in the Time of the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, as we suppose it did in the Eleventh Age? Or if the Belief of the Pope's Power above a Council be an Heresy (as the Council of *Basil* hath Decreed it to be) hath not that Heresy prevail'd as much since the Year 1516?

§. 70. 4. Is not the Infallibility of the Church here made *Felo de se*? While one Council pronounces those Hereticks, who deny the Supreme Authority to *General Councils*, and another denounces the Indignation of God against those, who deny it to the *Pope*? Put these two together, and they prove that all these are Hereticks, or incur the said Indignations, whoever have, or ever shall pretend to such Authority. And are not Popes and Councils very ill qualify'd for infallible Guides to Heaven, and infallible Interpreters of Scripture, who by the Mis-interpretation thereof have forg'd (the one or the other, Councils or Pope, or both) a false Commission, and have fall'n from the true Faith into such notorious Errors?

§. 71. The Council of *Florence* being on the same side with that of *Lateran* in this Matter, I need to say no more of it, but that there are two Councils against two, which makes my Argument so much the stronger. Remembring that *T. B.* at our Meeting, rejecting the Council of *Basil*, as a Council without an Head, to strengthen this Argument, I shall (as I promis'd him) add, That the Council of *Basil* was confirm'd by two Popes. Pope *Eugenius*, tho' at first he quarrell'd with it, at last submitted, and gave it Authority by (a) his *Apostolical Letter*, and approv'd its Decrees, as appears from the Accounts we have of that Council, and *Platina's* Complaint of *Eugenius*, for confounding Things Divine and Human thereby. And that these Decrees might want no Confirmation, *Nicolas V.* with the Advice of his Cardinals, approv'd, ratify'd and confirm'd the Acts of the Council of *Basil*, and denounc'd the Wrath of Almighty God, and the Blessed Apostles *Peter* and *Paul*, upon any one that should presume to contradict or infringe the Bull of his said Approbation, Ratification and Confirmation, *Dat. 14. Cal. Jul.*

(a) *Plat. de vi-*
vis Pontif. edit-
Agrip. 1540.
p. 272. Conci-
lio Basiliensi,
unde infinita
mala orta sunt;
authoritatem
dedit, approba-
vis eorum per
litteras Apostoli-
cas decretis.

Ben. Concil.
Gen. tom. 4.
p. 97.

1449. I come now to Examine *T. B's* Defence of his second Argument from *Scriptures*. And here as before I perceive *T. B.* loves to Fight in the Dark, and lay about him without considering what the true State of the Question between us is. I shall therefore shew,

1. What

1. What is a Protestant's Rule of Faith.
2. What Deference we give to the Church with regard to the Scriptures, both as to the Authority and the Sense of them.
3. What we deny to the Church in respect of the Scriptures, which the Church of Rome ascribes to her. After which
4. I will answer T. B's. Objections both from Authority and Reason.

S. 72. (1.) For the first, By *Faith* we mean the Belief of the whole *Christian* Doctrin, reveal'd by Christ to his Apostles, and by them deliver'd to us: And by *Rule* we mean that Thing, by which we understand what is the *Christian* Doctrin, and what is not. And this Rule we say is the *Scriptures only*, since they were written. For before the Writing of the *New Testament*, the Apostles Doctrins we grant were the Rule. Take St. Chrysostome's Account hereof——That Christ left nothing in Writing to his Apostles; but instead thereof did promise to bestow upon them the Grace of his Holy Spirit, saying (Jo. 14.) he shall bring all Things to your Remembrance, &c. but because in progress of Time there were many grievous Miscarriages both in Matter of Opinion, and also of Life and Manners; therefore it was requisite that the Memory of this Doctrin should be preserv'd by Writing.

Chrys. hom. 2.
in Matt.

(1.) Writing we think a sufficient Means to convey a Doctrin to the knowledge of those who Live in Time very remote from the Age of its first Delivery.

(2.) That the Books of Scripture are sufficiently plain, as to all Things necessary to be believ'd and practis'd.

(3.) We have sufficient Assurance that the Books of Scripture are convey'd to us without any material Corruption or Alteration. These three Propositions cannot reasonably be disputed.

(4.) In the first Ages the Scripture hath been acknowledg'd by all Christians, to be the Means whereby Christian Doctrins have been convey'd to them with greatest Certainty. In clearing this, I shall argue from the Practice of the Churches Enemies, and from the Practice and Declarations of ancient Fathers.

S. 73. 1. It is certain that the Adversaries of Christianity always look'd on the Scriptures as the Standard of Christian Doctrins, and took it for granted, that that was the Christian Faith which is contain'd in those Books. What else made them so industrious to Extort them out of the Hands of Christians, but in hopes by that Means to Extirpate Christianity? But if these

were

were mistaken, and their Malice wanted Wit, if Christianity might be safe, tho' these Books were lost, what made the ancient Christians so tenacious of them, that they would rather part with their Lives than their Bibles, and censur'd the Traditors that gave up their Bibles out of fear for Apostates?

§. 74. 2. The Fathers in their Homilies declare to the People out of the Scripture, what they are to Believe and Practice, which had been very absur'd, had they not thought the Scriptures to be the Rule of Faith and Manners.

§. 75. 3. The Fathers cite Scriptures as plain Proofs in Matters of Controversies. Justin M. disputing with Trypho about a Point, wherein he had Tradition on his side, tells him he would bring such Proofs, as no Man could gain-say. Attend, says he, to what I shall recite out of the Holy Scriptures, Proofs which need not to be explain'd, but only to be heard. And Constantine in his solemn Oration to the Council of Nice, bewailing their mutual Oppositions, especially in Divine Things, thus says, The Books of the Evangelists and Apostles, and the Oracles of the Old Prophets do evidently teach us what we ought to think of the Divine Majesty. Therefore laying aside all seditious Contentions, let us determine the Matters in Question by Testimonies out of the Divine Writings. And St. Hilary not only commends Constantinus for regulating his Faith only according to those Things, that are written, but also adds, He that refuses this is Antichrist, and he that dissembles in it is Anathema, which sure is to pronounce the Scriptures the only Rule of Faith. And indeed,

Theodoret. Hist.
L. I. c. 7.

Hilar. ad Con-
stantium.

§. 76. 4. The Fathers in plain Terms teach the Scriptures to be the Rule of Faith. And here I might be Voluminous, but two or three plain Testimonies shall suffice.

Iren. L. 3. c. 1. Irenaeus says, The Method of our Salvation we have not known by any other, but those Men, by whom the Gospel came to us, which then they Preached, but afterward by the Will of God deliver'd it to us in the Scriptures, to be for the future the Foundation and Pillar of our Faith.

Ep. 74.

§. 77. St. Cyprian says, Whence have you that Tradition? Comes it from the Authority of the Lord, and from the Gospel, or from the Epistles of the Apostles? For God testifies, That we are to do those Things, which are written. — If it be commanded in the Gospel, or contain'd in the Epistles or Acts of the Apostles, then let us observe it as a Divine and Holy Tradition.

Hom. 33. in
Ab.

§. 78. St. Chrysostome says, Among the many Sects of Christians it will be easie to judge of the Right, if we believe the Scripture, because these are plain and true; if any one agree with these, he is a Christian; if he Contradict them he is far from this Rule. And in another

another Place, having mention'd several Heresies, and directed to the Scriptures as the Rule for avoiding them, he adds, *But no Body will attend to the Scriptures; if we did, we should not only not fall into Errors our selves, but also rescue those that are deceiv'd.* *Hom. 8. in ep. ad Hebr. c. 5.*

§. 79. I might add many more Testimonies to this purpose out of Ignatius, Terentian, Clemens Alexandr. St. Augustine, Athanasius, St. Basil, Epiphanius, and others; but waving them all, I shall only add, That Optatus, concerning the Controversy with the Donatists, asks who shall be Judge? And answers himself, *The Scriptures.* Illustrating it by the Similitude of a Father, who deliver'd his Will orally to his Children in his Life Time; but when he was Dying, caus'd it to be written in lasting Tables, to decide all Controversies that might happen among them after his Death: The Application is so obvious, that I need not Transcribe the Passage, which is large, but proceed to shew

§. 80. 5. That some of the greatest and worst Heresies were suppress'd, while no other Authority was made use of, but the Holy Scriptures. So Theodoret observes of the Heresies about the Humanity of Christ, that before his Time they were by Divine Grace Extinct; and so Scriptures were found an effectual Means for putting an end to some of the most dangerous Heresies. Whereas Controversies were so far from being ended by Councils, that they broke out more violently after them: The Arian after the Nicene, the Nestorian after the Ephesine, and the Eutychian after the Council of Chalcedon: A plain Argument that the Doctrin of the Infallibility of Councils, or of the Guides of the Church was not then receiv'd. I come now

§. 81. (2.) To shew what Deference we give to the Church with respect to the Scriptures.

(1.) As to the Authority of the Scriptures, we do not believe that the Church hath a Power to make Books Canonical, that were not so, but merely gives Testimony in a Matter of Fact, in which all parts of the Church are concern'd. For this depends, as all other Matters of Fact do, on the Skill and the Fidelity of the Reporters, so that we receive the Scriptures of the New Testament from the Testimony of the Catholick, Apostolick Church, as we do the Old from the Jewish Church, as from good and credible Witnesses, but not as from an Infallible Authority. And as the Jewish Church was a credible Witness in delivering the Books of the Old Testament as Canonical, and yet was not Infallible in her Judgment of all Things relating to it, so we may entertain the New Testament on the Testimony of the

Chri-

Christian Church, and yet not account her Infallible in judging about the Sense of all Doctrins contain'd in it.

§. 82. (2.) *As to the Sense of the Scriptures.* We grant, That as we receive the Scriptures themselves from the Church Universal of all Ages handling them down to us, so we account it one of the best Means for finding out the Sense of Scripture, to observe what Doctrins of Faith have been Universally receiv'd in the first Ages of Christianity, who living nearest the Apostolical Age are most likely to give us the truest Sense of the Scriptures, taught the Church by the inspir'd Pen-Men thereof. And tho' we have not a Traditionary Exposition of every Text in the Bible, yet we have of the great and fundamental Doctrins of Faith, as plainly contain'd in the Writings of the first Fathers, and as unanimously asserted by them, as the Authority of the Scriptures themselves. And the Church of *England* receives the Definitions of the four first General Councils, and obliges her Bishops and Clergy to Expound the Scriptures according to the profess'd Doctrins of those first and purest Ages of the Church. We think our selves also bound, not lightly and wantonly to oppose the Judgment of the particular Church wherein we live, when her Expositions of the Scriptures do not notoriously contradict the Sense of the Catholick Church, especially the first and best Ages of it. We allow not private Men to oppose their Sentiments to the Judgment of the Church, unless in such plain Cases, as every honest Man may be presum'd a very competent Judge: And then we think all the Churches in the World cannot oblige us to renounce our Senses, and deny the first Principles of Reason, to follow them with a blind and implicit Faith. I proceed,

§. 83. (3.) To shew what we deny to the Church in respect of the Scriptures, which the Church of *Rome* ascribes to her.

1. Tho' the Instructions of the Church are a very good Means for understanding the Sense of Scripture, yet they are not the only Means. For the Bible is a very intelligible Book in such Matters as are absolutely necessary to Salvation: And if we could suppose a Man, that never had heard of the Church, and yet had a Bible in a Language he could understand, by a diligent Reading of it he might understand enough to be Sav'd.

§. 84. 2. If by the Church is meant a particular Church (according to the current Non-Sense of Papists, whose *Roman Catholick Church* is a Particular Universal) or if by Church is meant the Church of the present Age, it is false to assert the Church is a sure and safe Means to understand the Scriptures. The Primitive Church, that was Taught by the Apostles, and Convers'd with

with them, or their immediate Successors, is the best Witness - what the Doctrin of the Apostles was. And so far as we can be certain what the Faith of those Primitive Churches was, we allow them the best Guides for Expounding Scripture. We allow the Church only the Authority of Witnesses, which can reach no further, than those Ages which may reasonably be presum'd to be credible Witnesses of the Apostles Doctrin: And therefore later Ages of the Church, which were remov'd too far from the Apostles, to be Witnesses of their Doctrin, have no such Authority, nor one particular Church more than another.

§. 85. 3. That the synodical Decisions of the Church are not the ultimate Resolution of Faith; as if we must seek no farther for the reason of it, than the Church's infallible Authority in expounding Scripture. Christ and his Apostles were infallible Interpreters of Scripture, and yet they never bore down their Hearers with their infallible Authority, but confirmed their Expositions of Scripture by force of Reason, and appeal'd to the Judgment and Consciences of their Hearers, whether the Thing were not so. Christ commands the *Jews* to *search the Scriptures*, and the Apostle commends the *Bereans* for their generous Temper, in examining his Doctrins by the Scriptures. And as no Church can pretend to be more Infallible than Christ and his Apostles were, why should they assume more to themselves than they did? Let the Church of *Rome* convince us of the Truth of their Expositions of Scripture, as Christ and his Apostles did their Hearers by proper Arguments, and we will learn of them. The Fathers in their Writings take this way, by Arguments to clear their Explications of Scriptures. The Bishops in ancient Councils in Disputes of Faith, reason from Scripture and the Sense of the Catholick Church, not from their own Authority. And we think our Faith well founded, that hath the same Foundation that their synodical Determinations had, which was Scripture explained by the ancient Church without an infallible Judge. We *Protestants* have the same foundation of our Faith, as the *Nicene* Fathers of the first Council had, or that any Christians could have before there was any general Council; and with that we are abundantly satisfy'd without the Church of *Rome's* pretended Infallibility. Pretended I say, because there is no promise of Infallibility made to the Church. For if there be any such Promise, it is made either to the whole Church, or to some Particular: Not to the whole, for then the universal Church would be Infallible, which it cannot be whilst its several parts so much contradict each other in

Matters of Faith: And if any say the Promise is made to the particular Church of *Rome*, let them shew us the Name of that particular Church in the divine Entail.

§. 86. 4. We deny that visible Succession is a sure mark of an infallible Church. For then, First, The *Greek Church* is an infallible Church, which hath as visible, uninterrupted a Succession from Christ and his Apostles to this Day, as the Church of *Rome*: And then we have two infallible Churches directly opposite to one another in some necessary Points of Faith. Secondly, How came many Apostolical Churches, which visibly succeeded the Apostles, to be so infected with Heresies as to provoke God to root them up? As the *Asiatick Churches* were sad Instances. I conclude then, That tho' there were no Church now in the World, that could prove its visible Succession from Christ and his Apostles, yet while we have the Scriptures and the ancient Creeds, and other Records of the Primitive Church, we have Means sufficient for understanding what was the true Christian Faith, and the true Sense of Scripture. A Church that hath lost the Memory of its first Planters, may know the true Sense of Scriptures from the Scriptures themselves, and from the Doctrins and Practices of the Primitive Churches, which had the most visible uninterrupted Succession from Christ and his Apostles: And a Church that can Trace her Original by a visible Succession, may be so far from being Infallible, that she may be very Corrupt and Erroneous, if she forsake the Apostolical Tradition contain'd in the *New Testament*, and the first *Creeds*, as the Church of *Rome* doth.

§. 87. 5. Lastly, We deny that Unscriptural Traditions are to be receiv'd with the same assurance as Scripture Doctrins. This is *T. B's* Doctrin, and the Council of *Trent's*, but disclaim'd by us, who rely on the Scripture's sufficiency. And the Novelty of this Doctrin is fully clear'd by the most Learn'd Bishop *Stillingfleet*, in his *Council of Trent*, disprov'd by *Catholick Tradition*, where he argues it, — 1. From the Debates *Pro* and *Con*, that were in that Council about it. — 2. From the Divines of the *Roman Church* for some Ages before that Council — 3. From the Testimony of the *Canon-Law* against it. — 4. Of the ancient Offices of the *Roman Church*. And — 5. From the Testimony of Fathers: Where also he will find it prov'd, That the first Step toward the setting up Tradition for a Rule, was in the second Council of *Nice*; That it was never receiv'd as a Rule, till after the Council of *Lateran* under *Innocent III*; the occasion thereof being new Points of Faith, therein determin'd, and not otherwise to be maintain'd, and that it was never establish'd

blish'd for a Rule before the Council of *Trent*. To that Treatise I refer *T. B.* and the rather because no *Papist* hath yet (that I have heard of) pretended to Answer it. And now I come to the last Thing I propos'd about a Rule of Faith.

§. 88. (4.) To consider *T. B's* Objections, both from *Authority* and *Reason*.

(1.) *From Authority*. I need not to consider his Testimony from the Bishop of *Meaux*, for such Fathers I allow he hath enough on his side. But *Tertullian* and *St. Augustine* we cannot allow him, without suffering him to do them great Wrong. *Tertullian*, he but names in this last Paper, but in his first cites that *de Praescript. c. 17.* where he represents the Trial of Doctrins by Scripture as good for nothing, but to turn the Brain or the Stomach, and that the Issue is either uncertain or none. But he tells us in the same Place, that those Hereticks do not receive some Scriptures, and those they do receive they add to, and alter at their Pleasure. And what, says he, can the most skilful in Scripture do with those who will defend or deny what they think fit? And with such it is that he says, it is to small purpose to Dispute out of Scripture: And since the Rule must be allow'd on both sides, to prevent endless Wrangling about it, the first Thing do be done was to settle the Rule, and for this the Testimony of the Apostolical Church was of great use. But to make *Tertullian* to reject the trial by Scripture in all Cases, is to suppose him very Absurd, when he combates other Hereticks of all sorts out of Scripture, as appears in his Books against *Marcion*, *Praxeas*, *Hermogenes*, and others. Nay, he would Contradict himself, if that were his Meaning, since in another Place he saith, *That if we bring Hereticks only to the Scripture they cannot stand: And therefore Stiles Hereticks Lucifuga Scripturarum, decliners from the Light of Scriptures: Which he would never have charg'd on them, if he had thought that Controversies could not be ended by the Scriptures.*

§. 89. *St. Augustine* is cited in *T. B's* first Paper, and because I wav'd it in my Answer as Impertinent to our present Dispute, he brings it again with great Triumph in his Reply. We receive (says he in the first Paper) the Scriptures as the written Word of God from the Church's Authority in her first Plantation by Miracles, and perpetuated to us by an uninterrupted Continuance of her Doctrin. According to that of *St. Augustine*, I should not believe the Gospel, unless I were mov'd thereto by the Authority of the Catholick Church. And as we believe the Scriptures for the Church's Authority, so we believe the Sense of them for the same, according to the same Father,

Then we hold the Truth of the Scriptures, when we do what pleaseth the Universal Church.

§. 90. To this I answer, That by that Passage, *Evangelio non crederem*, &c. St. *Augustine* means no more, than that the Authority of the Church was greater to him, than that of *Manichæus*; for he had been sway'd by his Authority to reject the Gospel, and now he rejects his Authority, and gives Credit to the Testimony of the Catholick Church, rather than to him which does not make the Church's Authority greater than the Scriptures, but greater than that of *Manichæus*. The most that it can imply is, That the constant, universal Tradition of the Scriptures by the Catholick Church makes it appear Credible to us: Which can prove nothing as to the Church's Infallibility in interpreting Scripture, or the Roman Church's Authority in delivering of it. Especially if it be consider'd what St. *Augustine* saith elsewhere, when the *Donatists* us'd St. *Cyprian's* Authority, St. *Augustine* delivers this famous Sentence about Scripture, Fathers and Councils, That Canonical Scripture is to be prefer'd before other Writings; for they are to be believ'd without Examination; but the Writings of Bishops are to be examin'd and corrected by other Bishops and Councils, if they see Cause; and lesser Councils by greater, and the greatest Councils by such as come after them, when Truth comes to be more fully discover'd. This Passage is enter'd into the Authentick Body of the Canon-Law, only that Part which relates to correcting of Councils is left out, with what Honesty let the World Judge. And whereas T. B. is for supplying the defect of Scripture by unwritten Traditions, St. *Augustine* denounces Anathema against those, who deliver any other Doctrin than what is contain'd in the Scriptures. In the *Arian* Controversy against *Maximinus*, he desires all other Authorities may be laid aside, and only those of Scripture and Reason us'd. Sure then he thought the Scriptures sufficient to end that Controversy: The same way he takes with the *Pelagians*, advising them to yield to the Authority of the Scriptures, which can neither deceive nor be deceiv'd. This Controversy (says he) requires a Judge. Let Christ judge, let us hear him speak. Let the Apostles judge with him, for Christ speaks in his Apostles. So that I had good Reason for what I said, when I told T. B. he should have begun at the Scriptures, and made them the Judge in this Controversy, since both of us own its Divine Authority. And herein St. *Augustine*, and all the ancient Fathers are on my side. No (says T. B.) Father *de Meaux* is against us, and charges our Rule of Faith with two dreadful Inconveniences, which are T. B's. Objections.

§. 91. (2.) From

Aug. de Bapt.
contra Donatist
l. 2. c. 3.

Decr. distinct.
9. c. 8.

Contra Petil.
Donat. l. 3.
c. 6.
Contra Max.
Arian. l. 3.
c. 14.

Aug. de peccat.
merit. Et re-
miss. l. 1. 22.
De nuptijs &
concupisc. l. 2.
c. 33.
De gratia &
lib. arbit. c.
18.

§. 91. (2.) *From Reason.* Those who throw off the Authority of T. B. §. 55. the Church (he must mean an infallible Authority in interpreting Scriptures, and delivering reveal'd Doctrins written or unwritten) run into two dreadful Inconveniences.

§. 92. 1. *Thereby they render all Christians, of what Age soever, who have not read and examin'd the Scripture, incapable of making an Act of Faith: And then what will become of them that cannot Read? I answer, they that cannot Read may Hear, and Faith comes by Hearing, and Hearing by the Word of God.* We have the Scriptures read in the vulgar Language in the Church, we have 'em explain'd publickly in *Catechisms* and *Catechetical Lectures*, whereby our People that cannot Read, may know more of the Scriptures than you that can. An Act of Faith is an actual Assent to the Truth of those Doctrins taught by Christ. He that cannot Read may hear the Gospel Read, which contains the History of what Christ Taught, and what Miracles he Wrought to confirm his Divine Authority. This he may reasonably take for a credible History, as it is convey'd down to him by the whole Church of all Ages to this: And then he hath sufficient Reason to be satisfy'd of the Truth of Matters of Fact, that such Miracles were wrought; and if thereupon he Assent to the Doctrins of Christ, he performs an Act of Divine Faith. And that too without ascribing more to the Church than the Authority of a credible Witness. And tell me seriously whether this be not a better Act of Faith than the *Collier's*, who believes as the Church believes, while he neither knows what the Church, nor what he himself believes: For my part I admire how Men can have the Face to pretend that due Care is not taken by *Protestants* for the building up the Unlearn'd in the Christian Faith, when we lay the Scriptures before them in their Mother Tongue, which *Papists* with all possible Care conceal from them.

§. 93. 2. *T. B. from the Bishop of Meaux, says, That when T. B. §. 59. a Christian, how Ignorant soever Reads the Scripture, he may prefer his own Judgment in the Sense of them before that of all the Fathers and Councils in the World.* I answer, we allow not a private Person to oppose his Sentiments to the Judgments of the Church, *Supra Page 32.* unless in such plain Cases as every honest Man may be presum'd a very competent Judge, and when the Church would have us to renounce our Senses, and the first Principles of Reason. *T. B. §. 64.* falls very briskly on those that first prove the Church's Infallibility from the Scripture, and then prove the Authority of Scripture from the Church's Infallibility, as running themselves Giddy in a Circle. But I hope this Bolt is not meant against us, who deny the Church's Infallibility. Let his own Party, and he

he himself, that in his Papers pretends to prove the Church's Infallibility from Scripture, than the Scripture's Authority from the Church, see how they can avoid it. For does not *T. B.* prove the Church's Infallibility from Scripture, when he urges, *Matt.* 16. 18. & 28. 20. and *Joh.* 14. 18. all for that purpose? I desire him now to tell me how he knows those Texts are to be interpreted in that Sense? If he learn this from the Church's Infallibility, he turns round in the same Circle; Or if he can find the Church's Infallibility by the Scriptures without the Church's infallible Interpretation, I conclude the Scriptures may be understood without the Church: And if Infallibility can be found in Scripture without the Church, any other Doctrine of Christ may be found as well, and so there is no need of Infallibility. But there is no such Circle in our Resolution of Faith, who believe the Doctrines of Christ, because we find them taught plainly in Scripture, and universally receiv'd as the Sense of the Scriptures by the Catholick Church, by the best and purest Ages of it.

T. B. §. 69. §. 94. *T. B.* is pleas'd to ask me some Questions about the Church, to which it may be proper for me here to return an Answer.

1. Was there ever any Time since the Apostles, in which there were no Christians? *Ans.* No.
2. Were there ever any Christians, who making a sincere Profession of this Article of their Creed, *I believe the Holy Catholick Church*, did not believe there was an *Holy Catholick Church*? *Ans.* I believe not.
3. How could they believe, there was an *Holy Catholick Church*, if fallible in delivering reveal'd Truths, necessary for her Sanctification? *Ans.* Infallibility is not necessary to the Church's, either Existence or Sanctification. She may be faithful in delivering the Scriptures of the *New Testament* to us, which are sufficient to make us Holy, and yet be no more Infallible than the *Jewish Church*, that deliver'd the *Old Testament*. The Christian Church of the first Ages did not so much as pretend to Infallibility, and yet had as good Pretences to Sanctification as any since: Every Man that sincerely seeks after Truth, may expect such Assistances of the Spirit of Truth, as will secure him from Erring damnably: And yet every honest Searcher after Truth is not Infallible.

Matt. 28. 20. §. 95. When I extend Christ's Promise of his Presence to the end of the World to all Christians by his Spirit, I may conclude it was with good Reason, till *T. B.* brings better against it. *How*, says

says he, *can Christ be present with all Christians by his Grace, when so many turn Graceless?* I answer. They that turn Graceless, grieve that Holy Spirit, that would seal them to the Day of Redemption; and tho' Christ hath promis'd to all Grace sufficient, yet he hath not promis'd it shall be irresistably effectual on all.

§. 96. Again, when I confine the Promise of the Spirit of Truth to teach all Truth to the Apostles, I may also conclude my Reasons good, till T. B. can find better to invalidate them. He says, *The Governours of the Church in all Ages have as much need of the Spirit of Truth for the Government of the Church as the Apostles had.* But sure, after the Systeme of Divine Truths was compleated and deliver'd by the Apostles and Evangelists to the Church in the Canonical Scriptures, those Truths might be known by succeeding Ages without a new Inspiration, or a Spirit of Infallibility in the Governours of the Church. And that I am not Arbitrary in this Sense of that Promise I appeal to St. Chrysostome cited above, who says, *That Christ left nothing in Writing to the Apostles, but instead thereof promis'd to bestow on them the Grace of his Holy Spirit to bring all Truths to their Remembrance, and that too in order to their committing all to Writing.* So that as we need no more Scripture, than what is already written, there is no longer need of an Infallible Inspiration. And does T. B. in good Earnest believe this Promise belongs to the Pastors and Prelates of his Church? Are they all Infallible? May they not fall into Heresie? In a word, the Apostles Case was so peculiar and extraordinary, that there can be no just Inference from the Assistance promis'd to them, of what the Church would enjoy in all Ages.

§. 97. As to *Conversions* and *Miracles* and the Texts of Scripture T. B. grounds his Arguments from them upon, they can be no Proof of Transubstantiation, unless they be never-failing Marks of an unerring Church. Now that they are not, I have prov'd, and nothing material answer'd.

§. 98. (1. As to *Conversions*. If Hereticks have made Conversions, then Conversion of Heathens is no sure Mark of Truth. *Arian* Bishops and Doctors sent by the Emperor *Valens* converted the Western *Goths*. To this T. B. answers,

§. 99. 1. That *Arians* were not *Protestants*. What then? Were not *Arians* Hereticks and made Conversions? And consequently *Papists*, notwithstanding their boasted Conversions, may be Hereticks too. If *Arians* converted the *Goths*, and yet *Arianisme* was not thereby prov'd true, *Papists* may convert, and yet for all that Transubstantiation be an Error.

§. 100. 2. Here T. B. repeats his usual Calumny, that I plead for *Arianisme*, when I only confute his Arguments, by proving them

T. B. §. 73.

Rom. 1. in
Matt.

Supra p. 29.

T. B. §. 32.

T. B. *ibid.*

them no better than *Arians* may produce for themselves. And let the World judge whether is the greater Friend to *Arians*? I that all along suppose them to be Hereticks, or *T. B.* who produces such Arguments from Prevalence of Numbers and Conversions, as prove them to be as good Catholics as a *Romanist*? Suppose an *Indian* should argue thus; *Xaverius*, who converted me to Christianity, taught me Transubstantiation, might not a *Goth* say as much for *Arianisme*? By this Argument then one is as true as the other. And since I believe both to be false, I hope *T. B.* will no longer reflect on me for defending *Arianisme*, but rather retract his own Arguments, which do *Arianisme* as much Service as *Popery*. But,

T. B. ibid.

§. 101. 3. This Conversion says *T. B.* was particular. What means he? Was it not the Conversion of a numerous People, the *Western Goths*, and from them the *Eastern Goths* and the *Gepida*? And was this only a particular Conversion? If he mean by particular, but one Instance, that is enough to overthrow his Argument. If *Arian* Hereticks did convert, *Popish* Conversions may be another Instance of Conversions made by Hereticks: And what *Tertullian* says (cited by him) must be understood, as what for the most part happens, but not always without Exception. But,

§. 102. 4. *Goths* were partly converted before, says *T. B.* I answer, Those *Goths*, that were converted by *Arian* Bishops, sent by the Emperor *Valens*, were not converted before, tho' other parts of that People might. What then? Do not *Papists* pretend that *Augustine* the Monk converted this Island? But doth not *Venerable Bede* tell us, there were Christian Bishops in *Brittain* before *Augustine* ever landed here? There were Christians in the *East-Indies* too before *Xaverius* came thither, the Christians of *St. Thomas* in *Malabar*. Must then *Xaverius's* Conversions stand for nothing? For nothing more than the *Arians*.

T. B. ibid.

§. 103. 5. *T. B.* says, The most ancient Proof of this History is taken out of *Salvian*, and *H. N.* is order'd to drudge for him in searching out the Place: But he thinks the Authors he cited for it sufficient, four creditable Authors, to which may be added *Socrates Hist. l. 5. c. 33.* and therefore desires his Excuse, if he trouble not himself to seek after *Salvian's* Testimony, which he needs not.

§. 104. I wonder *T. B.* does not object, that these Historians say nothing of any Miracles wrought by the *Arians* in these *Gothick* Conversions. But tho' they say not a word of any Miracle, yet as *Arians* were Pretenders to Miracles as well as *Papists*, so it is easie to prove by the same Argument *T. B.* proves *Xaverius's* Miracles,

Miracles, that they wrought Miracles among the *Goths*. For the Indian World, says T. B. (for the *Goths* he might as well have T. B. §. 81. said) to have been converted to the Belief of Things so far surpassing their Reason, to do Things so difficult and contrary to their natural Inclination, to hope Things elevated above their Comprehension, either requires Miracles, and then this Conversion and the Faith profess'd therein, have this great Seal of God upon them, or it was effected without Miracles, and that were the greatest Miracle of all. Let T. B. tell me, how he will answer this Argument in the Mouth of an *Arian Goth*, and I need not be at the Trouble to answer it, as he brings it in favour of *Xaverius*.

§. 105. I cannot but take notice here, that when to T. B's. T. B. §. 74. Pretences of Conversions by *Xaverius* in the *East-Indies* by Miracles, I oppos'd their Conversions in the *West-Indies* by Spanish Cruelties; he returns me this remarkable Answer. Tho' the Spaniards were cruel in plundering the Americans Gold and invading their Country, were they so likewise in Compelling them to embrace Christianity? To which I answer, that in the Reign of King James II. Papists would have perswaded us, that Men could not be forc'd to believe, and declaim'd against Penal Laws in Matters of Religion: How comes it then, that with the Scene of Affairs their Opinion is also changed? It is plain that was (as wise Men then verily believ'd) but a Pretence to serve a present Turn: When Time serves, all the Spanish Cruelties, as well as French Dragoons, shall be justify'd as a great Mercy, and depopulating Countries again boasted of as very merciful Conversions. And tho' H. N. hath T. B. *ibid.* no Spaniards to ship for the *East-Indies*, yet he may remember the Pope found great Store of the cruelest of them to ship for England, tho' not with *Augustine the Monk*, yet with a dreadful Armado, A. 1588. And T. B. may thank himself for this Reflection on the horrid Cruelty of that Design; which, if he be a Man, much more an English Man, he must abhor and be asham'd of. I conclude there is no Design of Converting us English Men, but by the merciful Methods of the Spanish Butcheries or French Dragoons; and I see how hard it is for a Popish Priest to smother the Mercy of his Spirit, which inclines him, when he cannot conviace, to compel Men to be his Converts.

§. 106. I shall close this matter of Conversions with this Account, lately communicated to me by a learned Friend. He that urges *Xaverius's* Conversions, what will he say to the Conversions in the *East-Indies*, by the Dutch Ministers in *Ceylon* and other Parts? In *Ceylon* alone, by Letters from Mr. Spect, Minister at *Colombo*, and Mr. de May, Prefect of the Seminary erected for the Instruction of the *Malabar* Youth at *Juffanapatnam*, it appears

that they have converted, without pretending to Miracles, within twenty or thirty Years past, above three hundred thousand Indians to the Christian Faith. In *Ambaina*, by Mr. *Valentine's* Letters, Minister there, it appears, that Mr. *Vandersluis*, by God's Blessing on his Ministry, had converted above thirty thousand, and that many more *Mahometans* as well as *Gentiles*, were daily embracing Christianity, when the Letter was written, A. 1686. To omit what can be said also of Protestant Conversions in the *West-Indies* by those, whom our Corporation de *Propagando Evangelio* have sent, and by others before them. These Accounts are in a Book, entitled *Novissima Sinica*, toward the end, publish'd by G. G. *Leibnitz*, a Privy-Confessor of the Elector of *Hannover*, A. 1699. And tho' it be rare in *England*, it is in the hand of my Friend and to be produc'd, if there be occasion. And now I may conclude, that the Glory of *T. B's*. boasted Conversions is over-clouded, and that if he hath any Modesty he will say no more of that Subject.

I proceed now to review what *T. B.* says
 (§. 107. 2.) *About Miracles.* *Augustine* the Monk's and *St Bernard's* I shall wave at present, because supposing them real they cannot prove Transubstantiation, which was no Doctrin of either of them: And yet not so totally wave them, but that I shall take occasion to obviate all that *T. B.* advances for them, by considering the Subject of Miracles in this Method.

1. That we Protestants need no Miracles.
2. That Modern Miracles are no good Proof of Doctrins.
- And
3. That there is no good Proof of Modern, Popish Miracles.

(§. 108. 1.) For the First. It is agreed on all sides, that the Miracles wrought by Christ and his Apostles prove all their Doctrins to be of God. And if so, there can be no Necessity that the same Doctrins should be confirm'd again by new Miracles in every Age. A certain Conveyance of former Miracles is sufficient for the Confirmation of the Faith of succeeding Ages. And the concurring Testimony of seventeen Centuries brings them with much Advantage to us. Since then all the Articles of our Faith, contain'd in the Apostles, the *Nicene* or *Constantinopolitan* and *Arbanasian* Creeds are in the Judgment of Papists Apostolical Doctrins, they have been already confirm'd by Miracles. We have no need to follow cunningly devis'd Fables, since we have a more sure Word of Prophecy, to which by God's Grace we will take heed.

heed. Our Doctrins are in the Scriptures of the New Testament, and all confirm'd already by unquestionable Miracles. And when we can have so much leisure from the malicious Endeavours of the Church of *Rome* against us at home, and of Sectaries rais'd by them, as to make a further Attempt abroad on Infidels (which is a generous Design encourag'd in this Reign) I doubt not but by the Blessing of God they may be converted without Miracles, by the same Methods we take to convince an Atheist or a Deist.

§. 109. (2.) Modern Doctrins are no good Proof of Doctrins now: But on the contrary, a Sign of Seducers. To clear this I shall lay down,

1. The Judgment of Fathers for Non-necessity of Miracles.
2. The Judgment of Popish Writers on that Subject.
3. That Hereticks pretend to Miracles. And
4. That such Pretences are an assur'd Mark of Heresie.

§. 110. 1. For the First. *St. Chrysostome* in 1 *ad Cor. Hom. 6.* proposing this Question, why Miracles are now ceas'd, and speaking of the first Miracles that prov'd the Christian Doctrins, concludes with these remarkable Words: *Then it was useful that there should be Miracles, and now it is useful that there should not.* And he gives this Reason for it, *That they who preach now, do not preach by Inspiration, as the Apostles did, but only that Doctrin which they receiv'd from them, and therefore make use of their Miracles to confirm the Truth of what they speak.* Else where the same Father complaining of the degenerate Lives of Christians, he says, *From whence now shall Christians be perswaded to believe? From Miracles?* *ἀλλ' ἡ γινέσθαι ταῦτα,* but these are not now wrought. And the Author in the imperfect Work on *St. Matt.* says, *That formerly true Christians were different'd from false by Miracles which they wrought: The false Christians either not being able to work any, or not such as the true Christians wrought, but empty Signs, such as caused Admiration, but brought no Benefit with them. But now this working of Miracles (omnino levata est) is wholly taken away, and found only pretended to by false Christians.* To prevent an usual Evasion from these plain Testimonies, from the Account *St. Chrysostome* gives of *Babylas's Bones* silencing the Oracle of *Delphos*, let it be observ'd, that there is a Difference between *θαύματα* and *σημεῖα*, the latter denote Miracles wrought to give Testimony to the Divine Commission of any one to deliver Doctrins from God, which he says expressly are ceas'd, and no further useful: But Wonders were done by the Martyrs as Attestations of their Sanctity.

De vera relig.
c. 25.

§. 111. St. *Augustine* delivers the same Doctrine with St. *Chrysostome*. For he says, that the Apostles by their Miracles have made them unnecessary to us now: For since the Catholick Church is now establish'd and diffus'd through the World, Miracles are not suffer'd to continue to our Times, that we may not always seek after visible Things, and lest Custom should abate the Esteem of them.

From these Testimonies it appears, that in the Judgment of these Fathers the main Intention of Miracles was to convince Unbelievers; and that the Christian Faith being since establish'd, there was no longer any necessity of Miracles.

Resp. contr.
Lutber. de capit.
tivit. Babyl. c.
10. Sect. 4.

§. 112. 2. *Popish Doctors* of great Note affirm the same, such as *Tostatus* Bishop of *Avila* on *Levit. c. 9. quest. 14.* and on *Mat. c. 3. q. 12.* and *c. 10. q. 21.* whose Words to avoid Tedioufness I refer to. Bishop *Fisher* also, mentioning the Words of Christ, commanding his Disciples to do the same Miracles he had done, and promising that they that should believe on him (*Mat. 16.*) that many Signs should follow them, adds, yet this Promise hath no Effect now. For no Man casts out Devils nor heals Diseases, and yet no one questions, but there are many that believe. But what then, was the Promise of Christ of none Effect? No, says he, *Christ intended it only for the first Ages*; but when the Christian Faith was dispers'd over the World, *There was no longer need of Miracles*. Nothing can be more directly answer'd to *T. B's*.

T. B. §. 79.

In Luk. 11. 29.
Tom 2. p. 64.

Argument, when citing those Words of our Saviour he thus triumphs. If Christ's Miracles prov'd his Doctrins, will Circumstances of Time alter it? Does Reason grow old? or is that which was Wisdom formerly, become Folly now? I refer him to Bishop *Fisher* for his Answer. And to *Stella* on *Luke*, who says, not only that the Power of Miracles is ceas'd, but also that the receiving it would do more Hurt than Good; and he compares it to *Ladders and Scaffolds*, which are useful while the Building is erecting, but troublesome about an House afterwards. For Men would say, that the Christian Faith was not sufficiently confirm'd before. And on this Principle *Franciscus à Victoria* (*Relet. 5. p. 200.*) and *Acosta* answer the Objection, why no Miracles were wrought in the Conversions in the *West-Indies*, the latter of which was cited in my Paper, that *T. B.* pretends to answer. To these add *Maldonate* on *Mar. 16. 17.* who teaches, that since the Christian Religion hath been confirm'd by Miracles in the Church's Beginning, there is now no necessity of Miracles for that end. And as he there cites the same Place of St. *Bernard* that I mention'd, and to the same Purpose, so he also quotes *Gregory* and *Bede*, who compare the Power of Miracles to the watering of a Plant, which is only needful at first, and is left off as soon as it hath

hath taken Root. These Men therefore believ'd, that whatever Miracles might remain in the Church, they were not wrought to confirm any necessary part of Christian Faith, which was sufficiently confirm'd by the Apostles Miracles. *Andradius* says, *Defen. fid.* that Miracles are *ostentimes false, always weak Proofs of a true Church. Trid. l. 2.* And whereas *T. B.* thinks it strange that I should affirm, that *T. B. ibid.* now Miracles are to be prov'd by Doctrins, there *Ferus* affirms the same; That the Doctrins of a Church are not to be prov'd *In Mat. 24.* by Miracles, *but Miracles by the Doctrins,* because Christ hath *23, 24.* fore-warn'd us of false Prophets doing Signs and Wonders, which is my next particular.

§. 113. 3. *That Hereticks have made great Pretences to Miracles.* It appears from *St. Augustine*, that the *Donatists* appeal'd to the *De Unit. Ec-* Miracles of *Donatus* and *Fontius*, who bids them to lay aside those *cl. c. 10.* feign'd Miracles or Diabolical Impostures; for either they were not true, or if they were, we have so much the more Reason to beware of them, because our Saviour hath foretold, that *false Prophets should arise working Signs and Wonders,* that if it were possible they should deceive the very Elect. And lest any should say, that *St. Augustine* only upbraids the *Donatists* with lying Wonders, but does not take from the true Church the Evidence of Miracles, he adds, that *the Catholicks* do not bring the Evidence of Miracles to prove the true Church by; for all such Things are to be approv'd, because they are done in the Catholick Church, and not that the Church is prov'd to be Catholick, because such Things are done in it; and thence concludes, that *Controversies of the Church are to be ended by the Scriptures.* And what is this? But the same I say, that Miracles are to be try'd by Doctrins, and not Doctrins by Miracles. I might add out of *Philostorgius*, the *Arian* Bishops Pretences to Miracles, as *Socrates* attributes them to the *Novatians.* And what kind of Note then can they be of Truth? Nay,

§. 114. 4. *The Pretences to such a Proof of Doctrins by Miracles is a sure Sign of Seducers.* For we have been fore-warn'd, that *false Prophets should come with Signs and lying Wonders and all Deceivableness of Unrighteousness,* to countenance an Apostacy and falling away from the Faith. So that as after the *Jewish* Law was authoriz'd by *Moses's* Miracles, the *Jews* were not to believe a Prophet that pretended to Miracles, till the *Messias* came, who was prefigur'd by, and to put an end to those legal Institutions: So the *Gospel* being once confirm'd by Christ's Miracles and his Apostles, we are not to believe any afterwards for their Miracles, if their Doctrins be not agreeable to Christ's, as no doubt the two Witnesses *T. B.* speaks of will be; but Transubstantia-
tion.

tion I am sure is not. It is reasonably expected from the Church of *Rome*, that she give us an infallible Comment on the Scriptures (for what else is her Infallibility good for) and then we shall know whether these two Witnesses and their Miracles are to be understood literally or allegorically. And till then I see no necessity of considering *T. B's*. Argument from the Witnesses any further.

God its certain does not go beyond the common Effects of Nature to little or no purpose. In the Scriptures we find Miracles wrought very sparingly, unless it were for the Confirmation of a new Religion, as that of *Moses* and *Christ*. When then afterwards we find such abundance of Miracles pretended to, that every Age and Country of one sort of Men Boast to be full of them, we have so little Reason to think God hath chang'd the Method of his Providence, that it is more reasonable to conclude them lying Wonders of Seducers, mistaken and applauded by Ignorance and Credulity. Especially since we have so plain a Prophecy of a great Apostacy in the Christian Church to be carry'd on by such Pretences. *Acosta* says, That in the time of *Antichrist* it will be an hard Matter to discern true and false Signs, when the latter shall be many and great, and very like the true: And he cites it from *Hippolytus*, whom he calls an ancient Writer, That *Antichrist* should raise the Dead, as well as cure Diseases, and have command over the Elements. Sure then nothing can be more reasonable, than after such Fore-warnings to Examine all Pretences of Miracles by Doctrins; since there are no sufficient Distinctions either from number or greatness between true and lying Wonders. And consequently the pretended Miracles of Papists for Transubstantiation are not so strong Arguments of its being a true Doctrin, as the Absurdity of that Doctrin, and its Inconsistence with Sense, Reason and Scripture is of their being lying Wonders, or those Liars that relate them: Which is the last Thing I propos'd to prove on this Subject of Miracles.

§. 115. (3.) That there is no sufficient Proof of Modern Popish Miracles, all the Legends, and relations whereof are owing only to Credulity. And will appear to any one that considers these following Particulars, which with many others are fully prov'd by Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his second Discourse in Vindication of the Protestant Grounds of Faith.

§. 116. 1. That many of their Miracles have been receiv'd on the credit of Fables, and lying Reports: As he shews at large in the Instances of *Loreto* in Italy, *Compostella* in Spain, and *St. Maximin's Church* in France. The best that can be said for most of them is, what *Capgrave* says for *St. Maxensia's* carrying her Head in

Matt. 24. 24.
2 Thess. 2. 9.

Acosta de temp.
Noviss. l. 2.
c. 9.

Still. p. 441.

Capgr. p. 223.

in her Hands, that faithful People have receiv'd it from their Fathers by certain Tradition. Just as good Proof as Children produce for their Stories of Witches appearing like Cats, which have been receiv'd by the like certain Tradition in Winter-Evening Conferences among Credulous People.

§. 117. 2. That the Interest of Papists is advanc'd by the Credit of their Miracles, which enrich their Temples, and increase the Wealth of their Orders. He that compares the Tables of Miracles at some Popish Shrines, with the rich Presents accruing from them, must be very Credulous, if he take their bare Word, when there are such Rewards for Lying. The Apostles had no Prospect of getting Wealth by their Miracles, but lost their Lives and Estates for that Faith, which was confirm'd by them. But when did any Man lose so much as a Finger, or endanger it in giving Testimony to their Miracles, which for Profit they encourage as much as they can? Men will easily strain to represent an ordinary Accident by the trifling Change of a Circumstance or two into a Miracle for such great Advantages. And they must Pardon us, if we be Cautious in believing them, when it is so much their Interest to Lie. And

§. 118. 3. It is a known Principle among many of them, not Still. *Ibid.* p. to stick at a Lie for the Service of their Cause. To encourage the 654. Popish Party in a Design against us, A. 1586, and 1587, a pretended Miracle of casting out Devils was manag'd by the Jesuits Weston, Edmunds, Tyrrill, and others, which was detected, the Examination recorded in the Court of High Commission, and Printed A. 1604. In which Tyrrill, a Priest upon Oath, not only confess'd the Cheat, but adds under his own Hand this material Passage. *Altho' both my self, and so I think of the rest, did know that all was but Counterfeit, yet for as much as we perceiv'd, that thereby great Credit did grow to the Catholick Cause, and great Dis-credit to the Protestants, we held it Lawful to do as we did.* For, says he, the general Conceit of all the Priests of that Order is, That they may deny any Thing which being confess'd doth turn to the Dishonour of the Catholick Church of Rome, and that they do not account it Evil to calumniate the Protestants by any Device whatsoever, that may carry any Probability with it, nor make any Conscience at all to tell or publish any Untruths, which they think being believ'd may advance and promote such Points and Matters as they take upon them to defend for the Honour of the Church of Rome, and Dignity of their Priesthood. Ludovicus Vives, gives this Account Ludov. Vives. of the Lives of their Saints, That they are generally corrupted with Tradit. discip. abundance of Lies, while the Writer indulges his own Passion, and 1. 5. sets down not what the Saint did, but what he would have had him done.

T. B. §. 78.

done. So that in their Lives we see the Mind of the Writer, and not the Truth: For there have been those, who thought it a piece of Piety to tell Lies for Religion; which is a very dangerous Thing, lest by that means the true be rejected for the sake of the false. Now since, what hath been, may be still, tho' the Portugal Ambassador was so weak as to credit Depositions concerning Xaverius's Miracles, made or manag'd by Jesuits, Men of such a Character; T. B. must Pardon us if we cannot perswade our selves to be so Credulous. And for his two Protestant Witnesses, I much question whether he be able to produce them. He sent me to Oxford for Hartwell, and to Cambridge for Pory, and from both Places I am assur'd that they are neither to be found. And how lame a Proof this is, will appear by this plain Resemblance.

§. 119. Suppose there had been a Report in the Reign of K. James II. that a great Miracle had been done by the Papists in Lancashire; that E. T. Esq; a Papist, and then in the Commission of the Peace, had gone to the Place, and taken several Depositions upon Oath to prove the Matter of Fact. Suppose T. B. had urg'd me with the illustrious Authority of these Affidavits; and I rejecting them, as being Testimonies of Papists only before a Popish Magistrate to promote a Popish Interest, he should add, I have two honest Protestant Gentlemen, Mr. Oaks, and Mr. Stiles, to back and strengthen these other Testimonies. Suppose hereupon that I should enquire of T. B. what Mr. Stiles deposes to his purpose, and he should answer, Mr. Stiles told me, that Mr. Oaks reports such a Story. And what says Mr. Oaks? Truly, says T. B. I have never seen him, but he Lives about an Hundred Miles off, and a Friend of mine tells me that he hath seen him, and heard the Story from him. I appeal to the World what Credit were to be given to a Tale of a Miracle thus attested. And this is exactly the Case here.

§. 120. The Portugal Ambassador was a Papist. Pory, T. B. tells me, he read himself in King's-Coll. Library in Cambridge, in June 1704. but when I ask'd him at our Meeting what Pory says, he answer'd, That he only referr'd to Hartwell, and that he had not seen Hartwell, but he was in the Bodleian Library. And Mr. Brereley had acquainted him with the whole Story in his Protestant Appeal. To this add, which sure will make T. B. Blush, if not lost to all Modesty, that in a Letter from a Learn'd Friend from Cambridge, I am assur'd, That no such Author as Pory is to be found in King's-College Library, nor in the Publick Library of that University: That he had consulted a Person as well acquainted with Books as any in England, who told him he had seen something both of Pory and Hartwell, but nothing relating to Xaverius's Miracles:

rales: That Pory Translated Jo. Leo Africanus descriptio Africæ, in which are some Notes of his own, but not here to be met with. Something of Hartwell's (says my Friend) I have now by me call'd a Report of the Kingdom of Congo, Translated out of Italian by Abraham Hartwell, and Printed at London 1597. This I have look'd over carefully, and find nothing relating to Xaverius, or any Thing like it.

And after this I expect T. B. should be so Ingenuous as to Retract this Argument, and resolve to be so wise as never hereafter to rely on his Friend *Brerley's* Citations of Protestants.

§. 121. 4. Modern Miracles are not wrought as the Apostles were in the Sight of their Enemies, and upon them too. The end of Christ's Miracles and the Apostles, was to Convert Jews and Heathens, and they were wrought among them openly, and upon them. They were oft Infidels that were Miraculously Cur'd by them, and Heal'd at once in Body and Mind. Can you have a more noble End, than to Convert us by your Miracles? If some were Obstinate against Christ's first Miracles, he did no more among them because of their Unbelief. Why then do you make no Essays on us that way, but send all Miracle-working Missionaries to Goa? For Truth's sake, if your Church hath any such Power of working Miracles, send us not to Japan, but heal our Sick and Wounded, and raise our Dead with a Word, in an Instant, perfectly and openly; or else in Honour to Christ and Truth forbear to Boast of Out-landish, foreign Wonders.

§. 122. 5. *Popish Authors Caution us not to Believe them.* I have already produc'd *Canus* and *Suarez* to weaken the Credit of *Bede*, as a very Credulous Historian, however otherwise Venerable: To them add *Ludovicus Vives* in the Book above cited, who says, That *Bede* in his History, and *Gregory* in his Dialogues, relate Miracles of common Report, which the Criticks of this Age will judge to be uncertain. And I desire T. B. to read the Collection of *Bede's* Miracles made by Bishop *Stillingfleet* in the Book before p. 589. cited, and then tell me whether he does not think them very Ridiculous. And he must Pardon us, if we cannot give Credit to any of his Stories, who in some of them shews his Credulity, and want of Judgment. And for *St. Bernard*, I am of the Man's Mind in *Erasmus*, who when his Friend had bid his Servant say he was not at Home, and so loud, that he Over-heard him, at his next Visit told his Friend out at the Window, that he was not at Home, and expected he should give the same Credit to his own Word, as he had done to the other's Servant: Which makes me rather believe *St. Bernard* disclaiming Miracles, than *Godfridus* adorning his Story with the Embellishments of such

P. 591.

Cajet. de Con-
cep. Virgin.
c. 1.

Pious Frauds. T. B. may find a short Collection of Gregory the Great's Report of Miracles in the same Place in Dr. Stillingfleet, which shews how well he deserv'd the Title of the Father of Legends, for which we reject his Testimony about Augustine the Monk's Miracles. To this add the Judgment of Cardinal Cajetan, who affirms that the Church hath no Ground to determine any Matter of Doctrine now on the account of Miracles, among several others, for this Reason, because the most Authentick Testimonies among them, in the Canonization of Saints are not altogether certain, because it is written, every Man is a Liar, and he supposes Faith must stand on a more infallible Certainty than that of their Miracles.

Quaest. Medico-
Legales. l. 4.
tit. 1. q. 4.
n. 3.

§. 123. To conclude, Paulus Zacchia gives this true Account of the multitude of Miracles among Papists; that no odd or unusual Accident happens, but the Credulity of the People improves it to a Miracle. If a Man escape out of a dangerous Disease, if in it his disturbed Fancy represented to him the Vision of some Saint, or if he escape some Danger, if therein he chanc'd to think of the Virgin Mary, these he cries up for Miracles. And I doubt not but many of the Romanists are too wise to believe these Pretences, and I for my part declare, that I am perswaded Alex. Halensis (cited in a former Paper, and not took Notice of by T. B.) was in the right, when he concludes them done either by the Contrivances of cunning Men, or the Operation of the Devil.

After this, I need not answer more particularly to T. B's weak Defence of Xaverius: As that Torfeline only denies two of them, since if two be false, all the rest that bear on the same Evidence lose their Credit, and that one positive Testimony is worth a Thousand Negatives; so that if one Man should have the Impudence to Swear T. B. hath wrought a Miracle, his own Declaration to the contrary, and never so many of his Friends attesting the same, must have no Credit. If the Portugal Ambassador can by the procurement of Jesuits, (that will stick at no Lies for the Honour of the Church, and their own Order) gather some Affidavits that Xaverius did Miracles, H. N. understands not Reason, if he think it sufficient to bear down such Authority by the Testimony of Xaverius himself, or any others. And if in this T. B. is in the right, I am content to grant, that I understand not right Reasoning.

T. B. §. 83.

§. 124. Nothing now remains of T. B's Arguments, but such as he grounds on disputed Texts. Tho' it may not be improper to enquire, why the Words of Institution should be call'd a disputed Text, and not the other. For if this be all the Reason

son (as it is all he mentions) that we Dispute with Papists about the Sense of it, why are not the other disputed Texts too? Since we no more allow Infallibility to be the Sense of the first Set of Texts, nor Conversions to be a certain Note of the true Church from the second, than we do a substantial Change in the Eucharist from this. So that for what I can see here is a Distinction without a Difference. I might here more justly Charge T. B. with Self-Contradiction, than he does me on less occasion; T. B. §. 63. who in one Place cites this Text, *This is my Body*, as such a clear Proof of a substantial Change, as to discourage the Devil from making any Attempts against it for above a Thousand Years, and yet here it sinks into a dubious and disputed Testimony.

§. 115. However, the Words of Institution T. B. saith he hath prov'd to make more for them than for us by four Reasons.

1. Because the literal Sense expresses a substantial Presence. No more I say than *the Rock is Christ* doth.

2. Because they imply a Testament. And they may do so without implying a substantial Change. And if a Friend gave his Will (wherein he had left me a House and Lands) with these Words, *this is my House and Lands*, I should not think my self wrong'd, tho' these Words were interpreted Figuratively. This is the Deed, whereby I convey to you a Right and Title to my House and Lands.

3. Because they imply a Law. And is it necessary that a Law must have a Non-sensical Interpretation, or it can be no Law? I have shew'd in the Vindication of my first Paper, that we take the Words in the most obvious Sense, and that T. B's is perfect Non-sense, notwithstanding his mistaken Testimony of St. *Augustine*, about carrying his Body in his Hand. However, I am glad that T. B. owns the Words of Institution to be a Law. For, *If take, eat, &c.* be a Law, *Drink ye all, &c.* must be a Law too, and then the Church of Rome's Sacrilege in depriving the Laity of the Cup is a violation of Christ's express Command.

4. They imply a Sacrifice, which requires T. B's. literal Sense. I answer, it may be a Sacrifice without a carnal and corporal Eating. I agree with the *Master of the Sentences*, who determines, that which is offer'd and consecrated by the Priest is call'd a Sacrifice and Oblation, because it is the Memorial and Representation of a true Sacrifice, and holy Immolation made on the Altar of the Cross. Once, says he, *Christ dy'd on the Cross, and there was Sacrific'd in himself; but every Day he is Sacrific'd in the Sacrament, because in the Sacrament there is a Re-*

membrance made of that which was once done. In this commemorative Sacrifice we partake of Christ's Body Sacramentally and Spiritually, which is all that the Analogy which a Sacrifice requires

T. B. §. 86.

§. 129. I cannot but take Notice here of an Instance T. B. gives us of this critical Skill in Greek, when he says, *That this Sacrament, being the only Sacrifice from whence all other Sacraments derive their Virtues, is call'd Eucharist by way of Excellence in Comparison to the other Sacraments.* For my little Knowledge in the Greek Language cannot find out, how *Eucharist* comes to signify an Excellence of a Sacrament or Sacrifice. In my *Lexicons* it signifies *Thanksgiving*, being a Sacrifice of Thanksgiving (not an Expiatory Sacrifice) in Remembrance of Christ. This Instance of T. B's. Skill in Greek, puts me in mind of such a Piece of Learning in *Isidore Mercator*, who forg'd the *Decretal Epistles*; and brings in Pope *Anacletus* deriving *Cephas* (St. Peter's Name in Syriack, and signifying a Stone, as *Peter* doth in Greek) from the Greek Word *κεφαλή* an Head, and then proving his own Supremacy by this silly Mistake.

Labbe. p. 529.
E. Bin. p. 49.
col. 2.

§. 130. I brought an Argument from Grammar against T. B's. literal Sense of the Words of Institution, which by his Answer he seems not to comprehend. I desire him then to consider why *το* or *Hoc* is the Neuter Gender, and without more Words he will see the Impertinence of his pretended Parallel, *Woman thou art heal'd.* And for his Citations out of St. *Augustine*, St. *Ambrose* and St. *Gregory Nyssen*, I have consider'd and answer'd them in their proper Places.

§. 131. To T. B's. Testimony from St. *Augustine*, explaining the last Words of my Answer, *The Flesh profiteth nothing*, they do not in the least thwart with any Thing that I have said, and therefore need no Answer. That Father its well known, was not for preparing our Teeth and Belly, but explains all with a *Crede & manducasti.* I shall therefore explain my self in the Words of *Tertullian*, *Tho' Christ says, the Flesh profiteth nothing*, the Matter of that Saying directs us to the Sense, for because they thought his Words hard and intollerable, as if he had order'd them (vere) truly to eat his Flesh, to determine the State of Salvation to the Spirit, he premised, it is the Spirit that quickeneth, and then adds, the Flesh profiteth nothing, viz. towards quickening. He declares also what he means by the Spirit; the Words which I have spoken unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life, he that heareth my Words, and believeth on him, that sent me, hath everlasting Life.—Therefore making the Word the Quickener, because the Word is Spirit and Life, he calls the same (Word) also his Flesh, because the Word also was made

Tertul. de resurr. Carnis
" 37.

made Flesh; and therefore as the Cause of Life to be desired, to be devour'd by Hearing and chew'd by Understanding and digested by Faith.

And now I come,

§. 132. (5.) To examine some new Allegations of T. B's produc'd in the fore-going Paper, viz.

1. The Words of the Constantinopolitan Council, which he thinks express Transubstantiation well.
2. Rabanus Maurus and Bertram, whom he takes to be for him. And
3. Luther and Zuinglius Conversing with the Devil, which he takes to be against us.

§. 133. (1. For the first, these are the Words. *For as we said, our Lord Jesus Christ design'd this, that as he deified the Flesh, which he took by a peculiar Sanctification according to its Nature, caus'd by its Union with his Divinity; so also it pleas'd him, that the Bread of the Eucharist, as the true Image of his natural Flesh, sanctify'd by the coming of the Holy Ghost, should be a Divine Body.* In which Words cited at large, and not by halves, as T. B. does to conceal what makes against him, I observe two things to overthrow Transubstantiation; one, that the Change in the Eucharistical Bread is illustrated by the Similitude of the Incarnation, in which there is no substantial Change; the other, that the Bread Consecrated and Sanctified by the coming of the Holy Ghost is call'd, *The true Image of Christ's natural Flesh*, and consequently not the same with it, as hath already been argu'd at large in this Paper.

§. 134. (2. As to Paschasius, Rabanus and Bertram, I find T. B. is willing to mistake the Hint I gave, that Paschasius was not wholly theirs, and would thence infer, that Rabanus and Bertram, who write against him, were not against them. Whereas my plain Meaning was, that Paschasius is inconsistent with himself, which shews, that the monstrous Opinion was not then lick'd into Form. However, the two Questions propos'd by Carolus Calvus to Bertram, are taken out of Paschasius's Book, viz. *Whether the Body and Blood of Christ, which is in the Church receiv'd by the Mouth of the Faithful be such, in a Mystery only or in Truth? And whether it be the same Body that was born of Mary, and suffer'd, dy'd and was bury'd, and rising again and ascending into Heaven, sits at the right Hand of the Father? And these two Questions Bertram determines against Paschasius, and against the Doctrine of the Church of Rome too. For Paschasius seems rather to be for Impanation or Consubstantiation than Transubstantiation; and he positively declares, that the Body and Blood of Christ is receiv'd, not Carnally, but Spiritually, by the Palate of the Mind, and the taste of Faith only.*

Raban. de in-
fir. Cleric. l.
A. C. 31.

only. However, because inconsistent with himself, he taught concerning the Sacrament, *That this is the Body and Blood of our Lord, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which our Lord suffer'd on the Cross and rose from the Dead.* Rabanus oppos'd that Error with all his Might, as he says in his Epistle to Heribaldus, cited in my former Paper. In another Place also he saith, *The Lord would have the Sacrament of his Body and Blood receiv'd by the Mouth of the Faithful, and reduc'd into their Nourishment, that by a visible Body an invisible Effect might be shew'd.* (If a visible Body remain, the Substance of the Elements is not chang'd, unless we can suppose a Body remaining without Substance, he proceeds.) *For as material Meat outwardly nourishes the Body and increases it, so also the Word of God inwardly nourishes and strengthens the Soul.* Which Words all T. B's. Skill in reconciling Contradictions, can never reconcile to their Doctrin of Transubstantiation. Whereas what T. B. cites out of him, only supposes a great *Sacramental Change* by the Divine Power, which we firmly believe.

§. 135. As to Bertram or Ratram I will,

1. Consider the Passage cited by T. B.
2. Produce some plain Testimonies out of him against Transubstantiation. And
3. Lastly, Remind him of their own Authors, that have given him up for an Heretick.

T. B. *ibid.*
Bertram Edit.
Lond. 1688.
p. 140.

1. The Passage cited by T. B. for Transubstantiation is in the 9th Section, *The Bread which by the Ministry of the Priest is made Christi's Body, sheweth one thing outwardly to Mens Senses, and inwardly proclaims quite another thing to the minds of the Faithful. That which outwardly appears is Bread, as it was before in Form, Colour and Taste; but inwardly there is quite another thing presented to us, and that much more precious and excellent, because it is Heavenly and Divine, that is, Christi's Body is exhibited, which is beheld, receiv'd and eaten, not by our Carnal Senses, but by the Sight of the believing Soul.*

§. 136. Now if T. B. had not cited this for Transubstantiation, I should have concluded it a very clear Testimony to the contrary. And it must appear to any unprejudic'd Person to be so, that compares it with other Passages of the same Author.

§. 137. 2. Which was the second thing I propos'd. For in the next Section of the Wine he says, when by the Priests Consecration it is made the Sacrament of Christi's Body and Blood, it appears one thing outwardly, and inwardly contains another. For what doth outwardly appear but the Substance of Wine? Taste it, there is the Relish of Wine; Smell it, there is the Scent of Wine; Behold it, there is the Colour of Wine, &c. proving the Substance of Wine to remain, because the Accidents remain, and appealing to our Senses for the Reality of both.

both. Again, having prov'd that no Physical Change is wrought in the Sacrament, he adds, Sect. 14. *In what Respect is this Change made, so that the Things are not now what they were before, to wit, Bread and Wine, but the Body and Blood of Christ?* For as to the Nature of the Creature and the Form of the visible Things, both (to wit) the Bread and Wine have nothing chang'd in them. And if they have undergone no Change, they are nothing but what they were before. I am sure T. B. may as reasonably pretend all I have said against Transubstantiation to be for it, as to say Bertram, the Author of that Expression, is a Favourer of it.

I might subjoyn much more as plain against it as these I have quoted; and indeed the whole Book is as full a Vindication of the Doctrin of our Church as can be. But I appeal to the Author, if T. B. will take the pains to peruse him, and the Vindicator of him, from the Glosses of Mr. Boileau, the Dean of Sens, which was printed at London 1688. And shall only remind him

§. 138. 3. Of their own Authors, that have given up Bertram for an Heretick. Sure T. B. will grant that the Trent Fathers, employ'd to censure Books, understood this, and wanted not Skill to try it by the Roman Standard, and yet they condemn Bertram into their *Index Expurgatorius*. And as the Pope that publish'd that Index was of the same Mind, so were the most eminent Doctors in, and soon after that time. Sixtus Senensis, who wrote within three Years after that Council, call'd it, *A pernicious Book of Oecolampadius against the Sacrament of Christ's Body*, that he wrested St. Augustine's Words to the Sacrament Arian Heresie, and made the Holy Eucharist to be nothing else but Bread and Wine in Substance, bearing Figure and Resemblance together with the Name of Christ's Body, which is not truly and corporally present, but only in a Spiritual and Mystical Way, and makes Berengarius to have reviv'd the same Heresie two hundred Years after. To the same Purpose, see Espeneaus de adorat. Euchar. l. 2. c. 19. Claudius Sainctes in pref. p. 8. one that was at the Council of Trent, Gregory de Valentia Comment. Theol. tom. 4. disp. 6. punct. 3. and to these I might add Cardinal Bellarmine, Alan and many more, who all reject it as an erroneous Book. But after all come the Divines of Domay, and in the Belgick *Expurgatorius* p. 12. thus say, *Seeing in other ancient Catholicks we tolerate, extenuate and excuse very many Errors, devising some Shift often deny them, and put upon them a convenient Sense, when they are objected to us in Disputation and Conflicts with our Adversaries, we see no Reason why Bertram may not deserve the same Equity.* And henceforward Popish Doctors have turn'd their Tune and strain'd their Wits, by convenient and favourable Glosses, to make Bertram a good Catholick. Now since the Doctors of the Church of Rome can so egregiously

mistake:

Vid. ind. in
Class. 2. B.
Sixt. Sen. in
pref. Biblio. S.

l. 6. annot.
176. n. 1. T.

Ibid n. 6.

mistake the Sense of an Author, and a Pope and Council censure him for an Heretick, which later Doctors so generally absolve, what Assurance can we have of the Continuance of any Doctrin from the Apostles time, from the Judgment of the present Church, to whom the Terms of Authors that convey them are so uncertain, as in one Age to be judg'd Heretical, and in another Orthodox? Where also is the Obedience of private Spirits and their Deference to Church Authority, when private Doctors confront Popes, Cardinals, Bishops and numberless Doctors, and the Council of Trent's Index too, all adjudging *Bertram* for Heresie, while *T. B.* and some late Doctors are for expounding him into a Catholick? And with the same Liberty they may construe *Berengarius* into a Roman Catholick, or *Athanasius* into an Arian.

§. 139. (3. And now to be even with me, for producing *Marc* the Conjuror, as the first that pretended to a substantial Change in the Eucharist, *Martin Luther* and *Zuinglius* are charg'd with conversing with the Devil, and having their Doctrins about the Eucharist from him. To these I answer,

Alanus de Ru-
pe. de dign.
Pfalt. c. 3.
Genon. Chron.
nic. Deipara.
A. 1213.

Concil. Nic. 2.
Ab. 4. p. 250.
D. E.

§. 140. 1. In general. The Devils testifie our Saviour to be the Christ, and the Apostles to be the Servants of God; and tho' they are Lyars, yet in that told the Truth, and perhaps had the same ill Design both in that true Testimony, and holding the Truth in disputation with *Luther*, that it might be less credited in the World for his Attestation. What thinks *T. B.* of the Rosary, upon *St. Dominick's* Preaching up which, the Devils cry out through the Air, *Woe, woe to us, we are bound with this Psalter with Chains of Fire?* And upon his tying of which to one possess'd with several Devils, they acknowledg'd, *That no Man, continuing in the use of the Rosary, could go to Hell.* Are these Matters less true in the Judgment of a *Dominican* for the Devil's Attestation? Let then *Luther* and *Zuinglius* be treated with the same Candor as *St. Dominick*, and this Argument is vanish'd. The second Council of *Nice* among their learned Proofs of Image Worship from Tradition, relates a Story of an *Hermit*, whom the Devil counsell'd to forbear Worshipping an Image he had in his Cell; but his Confessor inform'd of it, gravely advises him, *rather to go to every Bawdy-House in the City, than neglect to Worship the Images of Christ and the Blessed Virgin.* I desire now to know of *T. B.* whether the Devil in this Story did not give full as good Counsel as the Confessor? Or whether he thinks this Argument of those Worshipful Fathers very weighty? Which is just such an one as *T. B.* here brings for Transubstantiation.

§. 141. 2. But more particularly I answer, that *Luther* relates these Suggestions in the way of a formal and set Dialogue; so that it is only a Contrivance of his to make the Matter more divertive,

vertive, being perfectly the Style of the Convent in those Days. And this Excuse *Luther* makes for himself, *I beseech the pious Reader, that he peruse these Things with Judgment, and remember that I was a Monk.*

§. 142. But what shall we say for poor *Zuinglius's Albus an ater nescio*? Why, that I pity *T. B.* whose Ignorance here hath (I fear) ministred to his Malice. For if he consult *Erasmus*, he will find *Albus vel ater* sit us'd in Latin Authors for *faustus* or in-*Eras. Adag. Basil 1574*
faustus, and for an uncertain Person, we know not who; yet without p. 360.
any Suspicion of a Devil in the Case. And that *Zuinglius* uses this Proverb in the Sense of the *Classicks*, is evident, from what he saith in the very same Treatise, cited by *T. B.* wherein he relates his Dream; and about three Pages before it, *While*, says he, *on the 11. of April we were treating before the Senate about abolishing the Mass and the Adoration of the Bread and Wine, there a certain Scribe, Albus anater sit, non est hujus instituti, i. e. Who he was is not material to relate, rose up and thus complain'd, &c.* Now will *T. B.* needs conclude, that *Zuinglius* suspected this Scribe to be a Devil: If so, we have a Devil complaining of the abolishing of the *Mass*, as well as one furnishing Arguments against it; if not, then a Diabolical Suggestion cannot be inferr'd from *Zuinglius's* Dream. And I hope *T. B.* will be asham'd to produce such pitiful Stuff for Arguments hereafter. For if he challenge us to personal Reflections, he knows we can prove as bad Things of the Enemies of our first Reformers, as the worst of these false Surmises and Slanders against them.

§. 143. (6.) *The last Thing I promis'd in this Vindication* was, to remind *T. B.* of some material Passages, either carelessly or purposely pretermitted by him, tho' proper to be consider'd. I shall mention them in the same Order, wherein they lie in my Answer.

§. 144. 1. I observ'd out of *Irenaus*, that *Mark* the Heretick, in his Pretences to a substantial Change, is took notice of as a *Forerunner of ungodly Craft*, in Pretences to such a miraculous Change in the Eucharist; which, by the Testimony of *Alexander Hales*, I prov'd to be *Humane or Diabolical Impositions*. And tho' *T. B.* sent me a Letter on purpose to know where the Passage in *Alexander Hales* was to be found (which in transcribing had been omitted) and in an Answer I directed him to the Place, yet in his Reply he takes no notice at all of it.

§. 145. 2. My Citations out of *St. Chrysostome*, *Theodoret* and *Pope Gelasius*, to prove that the Substance of the Elements remain after Consecration, and that the Doctrin of bare Accidents without their Substance was an Heretical Tenet, are yet unanswer'd.

§. 146. 3. I observ'd out of *Bellarmino*, that no Writer for eight hundred Years, noted it as an Heresie to deny the Change of

the Substance of the Elements, tho' it is evident many affirm, that their Nature and Substance remain'd after Consecration, as they were before; an Argument, that so long the Church did not look on that for an Errour.

§. 147. 4. *Paschasius's* Doctrin is charg'd by *Rabanus Maurus*, in his Epistle to *Heribaldus*, as a Novelty. But that Passage is pretermitted, as also *Paschasius's* Confession to *Frudigardus*, That many were then doubtful of his Doctrin; as likewise *Du Pin's* Acknowledgment of the great Contests in this Age about the Eucharist, occasion'd by *Paschasius's* Book.

§. 148. 5. *St. Bernard's* Testimony is not took notice of, tho' I mention'd it as a *Preludium* to many more, that prove him ours, if there were occasion.

§. 149. 6. The late Publication of the Decrees of the *Lateran Council*, is not took notice of, nor of *Du Pin's* Testimony, that all its pretended Canons were only Pope *Innocent's* Decretals, and never authoriz'd nor subscrib'd to by that Council: Nor does he (tho' desir'd) shew us, how the Laity could be oblig'd to submit to those Decrees in the 13th Age, which were not publish'd till the 15th.

§. 150. 7. Against *T. B's* Plea of Prescription, I appeal'd to *St. Augustine's* Rule, *Quod Universa tenet Ecclesia*, &c. What the Universal Church hath held, and hath not been instituted by any Council but always retain'd, is in reason to be believ'd to have been deliver'd by Apostolical Tradition: Whence we conclude our Cause the better, and not the worse, for having no General Council's Decrees for it, tho' *T. B.* takes no notice of it, but still triumphs in our want of General Councils.

§. 151. 8. *T. B.* says nothing to the Text out of *St. Jude*, v. 3. That Seducers creep in unawares; nor to my Distinction between Heresies that openly attack the Foundation of Faith, and a Mystery of Iniquity, that insinuates its self under the Cloak of Piety and greater Reverence to a Divine Institution, which is a very material Consideration as to the discovering the first Author of an Heresie.

§. 152. 9. I observ'd it as an Argument of the Novelty of Transubstantiation, and that it was not well understood and digested in the 11th Age, that *Berengarius* was made to recant in two several Forms, one by Pope *Nicolas*, and another twenty Years after by *Gregory*; for what need of a new Form, if the former had been sufficient? And how came it, that a Pope and Council were so ignorant of their Doctrin receiv'd by undoubted Continuance from the Apostles, as not to be able to express it in satisfactory Terms at that first Essay? And to the same purpose I observ'd, out of *Bertram*, what a Schism there was in the Church in

Aug. l. 4. de
bapt. contra
Donat. c. 24.

in the 9th Century, and yet *T. B.* takes no notice of it, but calls on me here again to shew any such Stir.

§. 153. 10. I take notice of the Management of Popish Councils by the Methods of worldly Policy, and Tricks us'd to prevent free Decisions, which in the *Trent* Council was by some of their own Divines derided as a fetching of the Holy Ghost from *Rome* in a Portmantua, as the way to drive away the Holy Ghost from among them, and leaving them to believe a Lye; but *T. B.* cannot see this.

§. 154. 11. When I hint at the Prosecution of the Jesuits at *Rome*, for allowing their Converts in *China* in their old Idolatry by the *Dominicans*, *T. B.* puts it off, because it is only an Hint, tho' he is not ignorant of it; and what small Reason we have to think those Conversions of God, which are rather Perversions of Christianity, than Conversions of Pagans. And I think it no Character of their Orthodoxy, nor good Mark of their Christianity, that they compass Sea and Land to make such Proselytes. Tho' that Character of the *Pharisees*, so applicable to them, is not took notice of. As to their Conversions in *Europe* by Faggots and Dragoons, *T. B.* hath said nothing, unless this be, that there are other Marks of the Church, as Universality and Perpetuity to convince us without Miracles; and why not then without Dragoons? Or to what Purpose are the greatest part of Popish Miracles pretended to be done in Christendom, (where they are least needed) among Papists?

§. 155. 12. I had observ'd, that as Christ's Miracles were foretold, which when they were done according to the Predictions, became for that the more credible; so we have the very same Reason to discredit Popish Miracles, because such have been foretold to carry on an Apostacy; and have been caution'd, tho' an Angel from Heaven should come and teach any other Doctrin than what was Preach'd at first, he should be accursed: But of this not a Word.

§. 156. 13. I mention a Miracle of *Novatian*, and *Bellarmino's* Opinion, that it confirm'd not his Heresie, but the Catholick Truths he retain'd together with it; and that it might be so with the Miracles of *Missionaries*, (if they wrought any) that they may confirm Christian Doctrins and not Popish Heterodoxies. This, tho' very material, is pretermitted. As also,

§. 157. 14. What I hint at out of *Bede*, of *Augustine* the Monk's Pride and Cruelty, unbecoming an Apostle, and the trivial occasion of the Miracles in *Bede* pretended to be wrought by him.

§. 158. 15. *T. B.* takes no notice of two remarkable Observations in my Appendix: One, that *Milchior Numezins* says, many Miracles of *Xaverius* were discover'd since his Death: And what I take notice of from *Rabedensira*, who, for sixteen Years after *Ignatius Loyolas's* Death, knew no Miracle he had done, but Apologizes

for his not doing any, and yet fifty four Years after his Death, when he was to be Canoniz'd, could find enough.

§. 159. And now before I conclude, that *T. B.* may have no occasion to recriminate, I will review his Paper, and take notice of every thing material, that may in this Paper seem hitherto to have been pretermitted.

T. B. §. 15.

1. Of this Nature perhaps he may think that to be, which he says of the Threats whereby *Berengarius's* Recantation was extorted, alledging the Example of Councils, not only threatening but punishing with *Excommunications, Deposing, Imprisonments and Banishments*. I wonder he does not add with Threats of Fire and Faggot, (for no less was *Berengarius* threaten'd with, *Pap. Masson. Annul. Franc. l. 3.*) as also *Lanfranc* intimates) and then tells us, that the Papists were only in jest, when in the Reign of King *James II.* they disputed and declar'd against penal Laws, and compelling Men to believe. However, what I mention'd the Threats against *Berengarius* for, was only to shew, that his Recantation was only the Effect of his Weakness, and no Prejudice against his Doctrin, which was rather born down with Power, than confuted by Arguments.

T. B. §. 16.

§. 160. 2. Whereas *T. B.* says *Berengarius* burnt his own Writings at the Council in *Rome*; I hope he does not mean all that ever he writ, at least not those he writ against his Adversaries afterward. We have little of his Doctrin or Defence but from *Lanfranc* and his other Adversaries; and if the World were to judge of the Church of *Englands* Doctrin about the Eucharist, and my Defence of it by the Representation *T. B.* in his Writings makes of both, they would I am sure mistake both; and therefore I am more apt to conclude better of *Berengarius* and his Cause, than those bitter Adversaries represent them. Tho' I find *Lanfranc* represents his Doctrin much better than *T. B.* reciting these Words of *Berengarius*, By the Consecration of the Altar, Bread and Wine are made a Sacrament of Religion, not that they cease to be what they were, but are chang'd into another thing, and (*sunt quæ non erant*) become what they were not: wherein he expresses himself in the very words of *St Ambrose*. And whereas *T. B.* calls him a perjur'd Fellow, for retracting his forc'd Recantation, I say his Perjury was in taking, and not in breaking a sinful Oath.

§. 161. 3. Whereas I had alledg'd that the Eastern Patriarchs present in the *Lateran* Council were *Europeans*, and consequently not to be trusted as true Representers of the Doctrin of the *Greek Church*; all *T. B.* opposes is, That tho' not Native *Greeks*, they might be duly Elected. I grant they might, and yet not so lay aside at their Election all the Prejudices of their Education, as to become wholly *Greeks* in their Doctrins. Besides, they were never own'd in their Titular Sees, and consequently

we may conclude neither fit to testify the Doctrin of the Greek Church, nor duly Elected.

§. 162. 4. Whereas I observe, That in the *Greek* Copy of the *Lateran* Council, the first Chapter, wherein Transubstantiation is defin'd, is left out: *T. B.* says, That was not for the *Greeks* T. B. §. 26. dislike of Transubstantiation, but of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. I answer, That Chapter by *T. B.*'s Acknowledgment is left out, and therefore no Doctrin *Ibid.* in it can claim the Approbation of the *Greek* Church by Virtue of that Determination. In leaving out the whole Article, they disclaim it all, nor is it reasonable to argue their Consent from an Article, which they entirely reject. Beside, in the second Chapter, in condemning *Abbot Joachim's* Error in the *Latin*, are these Words, *Sic eadem res est Pater, & Filius, nec non Spiritus Sanctus, ab utroque procedens*, the *Greek* over against it is, *Καὶ ἡ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ὁ υἱός, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίον*. Leaving out *ab utroque*, which they might as well have done in the first Article, had they agreed to all in it, except that Expression. So that since they leave out the whole first Chapter, and not the whole second, tho' in this is the same exceptionable Term, *ab utroque*, as in that, it is reasonable to conclude they dislike'd all the Doctrins of the first, and consequently Transubstantiation.

§. 163. 5. As to the Council of *Trent*, I refer *T. B.* to what T. B. §. 22. hath been writ by my Lord Bishop of *Chester*, in the second Part of his Learn'd Discourse about the necessity of Reformation, and Bishop *Stillingfleet's* Council of *Trent*, disprov'd by Catholick Tradition; both Publish'd in the Reign of King *James*, and never yet answer'd: And if he will Answer them, it will then be time enough for me to undertake their Defence.

§. 164. 6. *T. B.* complains of me for Insinuating, That the T. B. §. 43. current Language of the Church was chang'd in the Eighth Century, as if the common way of expressing the Eucharist had been by calling it a Figure, and not the *Body of Christ*. But in this he plainly Mistakes me, for I grant that in all Ages it was call'd the *Body of Christ*, and so we call it, and believe it to be as much as the Church did to the Eighth Age: But the Innovation I charge on the *Nicene* Council is, denying it to be call'd an Image after Consecration, which was so usual in the Liturgies of the Church, and the Writings of the Fathers before. Which is so plainly my Meaning, that I cannot but Charge *T. B.* here, either with gross Ignorance, or Carelessness, or wilful Misrepresentation of me.

§. 165. 7. I had cited *Durandus*, and Bishop *Tonstall*, that there was no Obligation to believe Transubstantiation, as expressing the manner of Christ's Presence, before the Definition of the

Lateran

- Lateran Council*, which shews it was only a Speculation of the Schools, till that Council adopted it into an Article of Faith, according to their Judgment, and *T. B.* may find a deal to this purpose in that Chapter in *Forbes*, cited by him to no purpose at all.
- T. B. §. 44. But all this *T. B.* thinks sufficiently answer'd by a Verse out of *Horace*, as if those Citations had related only to the Word Transubstantiation, and not (as its plain they do) to the Doctrine express'd by it.
- T. B. §. 54. §. 166. 8. I cannot but admire at one Passage of *T. B.*'s, That the *Authority of the Church does not remove the Scripture from us, but puts us into a secure Possession of it.* For he cannot be ignorant, That his Church keeps the Scriptures out of the Hands of the People as much as she can.
- T. B. §. 63. §. 167. 9. *T. B.* says, *The Devil rais'd not any considerable Opposition against the substantial Presence from Berengarius, so Luther and Zuinglius.* I grant, *The Devil did not*; it was too much his Interest to promote Idolatry and Superstition: But that God rais'd up good Men within that space to oppose it, is very apparent from the *Wickliffites, Albigenes, Waldenses and Bohemians*, who for this are condemn'd in the Council of *Constance*. So that *T. B.* hath over-shot himself, and mistaken the Truth of History very much in that extravagant Rant.
- T. B. §. 69. §. 168. 10. Whereas *T. B.* urges it as a necessary Matter to be determin'd, *Whether Christ's Body be in the Eucharist by way of Transubstantiation, or only (as we believe) really and mystically, without determining the Manner*; because if there be not a *substantial Presence*, they are all guilty of Idolatry: I answer, this is a necessity they voluntarily bring on themselves by adoring the Elements, and may be remov'd when they please by abstaining from that Idolatrous Adoration, and only adoring Christ as we do (and not the Elements) in and by the Eucharist.
- T. B. §. 74. §. 169. 11. As to the Texts foretelling Conversions of Nations, *T. B.* says, *I mince the Matter, saying, That those Prophecies receiv'd their Completion in the Primitive Ages, as if he would say (says T. B. of me) if he could for Shame, that all Conversions for above a Thousand Years last past were false, and not compris'd in those Prophecies.* I answer, That I see no Reason to be ashamed of what I have said, That the Prophecies about Conversions of Nations have been remarkably fulfill'd; and consequently that if in any Age of Christianity there be no Conversions, that doth not Unchurch it: That a Prophecy once fulfill'd is true, tho' it should meet with no future Impletions, and that this Prophecy does not make Conversions an infallible Mark of Truth: Since *Mahometan Conversions* are much larger, than *Popish* can pretend to be. Besides, the Reformation of the Church from the grossest Errors and

and Idolatry, and bringing so many Nations back to the Purity of Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, are much more glorious Conversions, than any of the *Papists*; by how much it is better to rectify the dangerous Mistakes of *Christians*, than to pervert *Heathens*, and under a better Name make them worse Idolaters than they were before. So that I am not ashamed to call all their Conversions Perversions of the Nations; unless the Account of some be true, that *Xaverius* at first in *Japan* taught Christianity without the Additions of Popish Errors, in its genuine Purity.

§. 170. 12. I had forgot to take Notice of what T. B. tells T. B. §. 77. me, *The Centuriators write of St. Bernard's Miracles*: And therefore to oblige him will Transcribe here some part of what they say in the Place cited by him. He is reported (say they) or rather feign'd to have done many Miracles in France, Italy, Germany and Spain; which yet, if one Examine by the Rule of God's Word, it will be manifest that many were done to establish Errors, and there is no doubt, but through the prevalence of Superstitions much more is ascrib'd to him, than he ever did. But that the Reader may see what they ascrib'd to him, we will Recite some of them. After this Preface they relate many Miracles, but let the World judge by it, whether they gave any more Credit to them than I do. I expect in T. B's. next to have all our Protestant Writers that relate and expose the ridiculous Stories of Popish Miracles, transcrib'd as so many Witnesses of their Truth, that he may make himself as Ridiculous as his Friend *Bretley* hath here made him.

§. 171. 13. To my Expostulation, Why the Workers of Miracles among *Papists* are all sent Abroad, and shew no Wonders for our Conviction, T. B. answers, That in Christendom, where T. B. §. 80. the conspicuous Characters of the visible Church's Universality and Perpetuity appear, there are sufficient means for Conversions without Miracles. If this be true, I desire to know, why the greatest Number of Popish Miracles are reported to be done in Christendom, and in those Popish Countries that are most entirely devoted to Popery, and consequently least need them? He must Pardon us if we conclude, they dare not venture their Tricks among inquisitive Hereticks, but only among such as are over-grown with Superstition and Credulity, or over-aw'd by the Inquisition from prying into the Knavery of their Managers.

§. 172. And now I am not Conscious to my self, that I have pretermitted any material Passage in T. B's. preceding Paper without a sufficient and satisfactory Answer; where I have added a Reflection on his Conclusion, wherein he seems to impute my Dis-belief of Transubstantiation to my Pride, want of Devotion, or harden'd Obstinacy against clear Convictions. To all which I shall only say, that unprejudic'd Readers of our Papers will (I doubt

doubt not) find another Reason, sufficient to acquit me from his uncharitable Censure, viz. Want of *convincing Evidence*. I can assure *T. B.* that I have not neglected in the Course of this Debate to pray both for my self and him, that whoever hath the advantage, *Truth* may prevail. And I cannot but gratefully own the Divine Goodness, who hath assisted me, a Person never pretending, nor inur'd to Controversy before, to maintain hitherto the Doctrin of our Church against so formidable an Adversary, who hath been a *Man of War* from his Youth, and is cry'd up by his Party as their invincible Champion.

§. 173. I shall close up all with one Word to the Gentleman, for whose sake this Controversy is undertaken.

S I R,

You are, I hear, oft told, That if you should upon this Debate change your Opinion, the World would impute it to Interest, rather than to Convictions; which is a Suggestion I fear more than all my Adversaries Arguments. For unless you are an impartial Searcher after Truth, and resolv'd to follow it *through evil Report, and good Report, through Honour and Dishonour*, I can have no hopes to prevail against the prejudices of Education, the persuasions of Relations, and the insinuations of being sway'd by Interest. All therefore I desire is, That you will observe *St. Paul's Rule* in this Case, to *hold the Mysteries of Faith in a pure Conscience*. Begin with your Morals; see in the first Place that your Life be thoroughly Christian, that you Live *Righteously, Soberly, and Godly*, according to the Dictates of your Conscience: And then God will not suffer you to continue in any dangerous Errors. For so long as any Men resolve to indulge irregular Passions or Appetites, it is in vain to endeavour the reforming of their Faith, whereas if they take up firm Resolutions to Live according to the Will of God in all Matters that they know, they will submit to the Evidence of Truth, whatever Discouragements may interpose, whatever Calumnies they may foresee. And that God would lead you into all Truth and Virtue, shall be the constant Prayer of

2 AP 63 S I R,

Your sincerely Affectionate

and Humble Servant,

Henry Newcome.

O F

Transubstantiation, &c.

THE

Second PART,

OF

Transubstantiation, &c.

1. That this Doctrine hath no Foundation in the Words of Institution.
2. That it undermines the Foundation of our Christian Faith by contradicting our Senses.
3. That it contradicts the most unchangeable Principles of Reason.
4. That it is repugnant to the plain Sense of Scripture.
5. That it was never believed by, much less believed by, the ancient Fathers.
6. That there is no more Ground in the Words of Institution for Transubstantiation, than there is to prove the Christ was substantially and corporeally changed into a Deer, a Fox, or a Lion.

could not find another Reader, sufficient to support me from his
uncharitable Censure, etc. Want of necessary Evidence. I can
only say that I have not neglected in the Course of this De-
bate to give both for my self and him, that which is both the
advantage, Time may prevail. And I cannot but graciously own
the Divine Disposition, who hath assisted me, a Person never pro-

the Disposition of our Church against the Propagation of Advancing
who hath been a Man of War from his Youth, and is every day
the Party of the Intemperate Champion.
I am, Sir, I shall close up all with the Word of the Gentlemen
and the whole for the Controversy.

T H E

ART. Second



O F

Transplantation &c.

of these Fruits, whereas if they take up from Botany to Live
according to the Will of God in all Matters that they know, they
will be able to the Evidence of Truth, whatever it may be.
And that God would lead you into all Truth and Grace, shall
be the constant Prayer of

C

and thank you,

Henry New...

Transubstantiation, &c.

§. 1. **T**HE Doctrin of the Church of Rome is determin'd by the Council of Trent in these Words. Contr. Trid. Sess. 13. c. 4.

Because Christ our Redeemer said, truly that was his Body, which he offer'd under the Species of Bread and Wine, therefore the Church of God always was perswaded of this, and this Holy Synod now at last declares, That by the Consecration of the Bread and Wine, there is made a Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole Substance of the Wine into the Substance of his Blood: Which Conversion is conveniently and properly call'd by the Holy Catholick Church, Transubstantiation.

§. 2. So that hereby the real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist is determin'd to be Substantial and Corporeal; Which if I prove false, the Church of Rome, that hath thus determin'd the Matter cannot be Infallible. In order to that I shall offer some Arguments on these Heads.

1. That this Doctrin hath no Foundation in the Words of Institution.
2. That it is contrary to them.
3. That it undermines the Foundation of our Christian Faith by contradicting our Senses.
4. That it contradicts the most unquestionable Principles of Reason.
5. That it is repugnant to Humanity.
6. That it was never known to, much less believ'd by, the ancient Fathers.

§. 3. (1.) There is no more Ground in the Words of Institution for Transubstantiation, than there is to prove that Christ was substantially and corporeally chang'd into a Door, a Vine or

a Rock. For as it is said, *This is my Body*: It is also said, *I am the Vine*, and *the Rock is Christ*, and there is no more Reason that the first Expression shou'd signify a substantial Change, than the latter. This is so clear, That many Learn'd Men of the *Romish Church* grant that this Doctrin cannot be prov'd by Scripture, as I undertake to prove if it be question'd.

§. 4. (2.) Transubstantiation is contrary to that Scripture. For when Christ at the Institution said, *This is my Body*, holding the Bread in his Hand, it cannot be understood of a substantial Change; For then Christ had his whole Body in his Hand, and gave his whole Body to the Twelve, and yet kept it wholly to himself. Which is so absurd, that nothing can be more. Besides, he calls it then his Body, which was broken for them, and yet it was not literally broken before his Passion, when he first instituted this Sacrament. And since you are for a literal Sense, judge impartially whether ours or yours be most literal; if a Man pointing to the King's Person should say, *That is the King*, the literal Sense would be, that is the King's Person: But if pointing to a Picture he should say, *That is the King*, the literal Sense would be, that is the King's Picture. Likewise had Christ laid his Hand on his Breast, and said, *This is my Body*, it must have been understood of his substantial Body: But when being about to Institute a Sacrament, he takes Bread, blesses and breaks it, and then giving it to his Disciples, says, *Take, Eat, this is my Body*; the most plain and obvious Sense is, This is the Sacrament of my Body. The Bread could not be literally Christ's broken Body, before his Body was broken; not consequently at the Institution, which was before his Passion. And certainly the Disciples never imagin'd that the Wine at the Institution was turn'd into Christ's Blood: For then St. Peter, who refuses to Eat unclean Beasts, offer'd him in a Vision, would certainly have shew'd some Reluctancy to drinking Blood, so expressly forbid by the Law of Moses, which was not abrogated till all its Ceremonies were fulfill'd at Christ's Death. And if Transubstantiation could not be the Sense of these Words at the time of the first Institution, it cannot be the Sense of them now. For whatever was the Sense of the Words at first, is always the true Meaning of Them.

§. 5. (3.) Transubstantiation undermines the Foundation of Christian Faith. For what Reason have we to believe the Doctrins of Christ, but that he deliver'd them as coming from God, and confirm'd his Commission by Miracles? Especially by his Resurrection from the Dead? But what Evidence can there be of this, or any other Miracles, but from the Testimony of Sense?

When

Part II. Of Transubstantiation, &c.

5

When the *Bapists*'s Disciples come to Jesus from their Master with this Question, *Art thou he that should come* (that is, the promised *Messias*) or look we for another? He gives them this Answer, *Go shew John again those Things you do hear and see. The Blind receive their Sight, and the Lame walk, &c.* Which is a plain Appeal to their Senses for the Truth of his Miracles, and the Proof of his Divine Authority. And again, Christ says to his Disciples, doubting of the reality of his Resurrection, *Handle me, and see me, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones as ye see me have.* Either this was a good and solid Proof, or not. If not, Christ put a Fallacy on his Disciples. If it were, then the Testimony of the Senses is to be credited in sensible Matters, and that which to our Sight, taste and touch seems Bread, is not Flesh. How could the Apostles perswade Men to believe the Miracles of Christ, but by perswading them to give Credit to their Testimony, who were Eye-Witnesses of them? But how could they perswade them to believe Transubstantiation (if that had been one of their Doctrins) but by perswading them not to believe their Senses? So that if our Senses are not to be trusted, there is no Evidence of the Truth of the Christian Religion: And if they are to be trusted, Transubstantiation cannot be true, which is contradicted by them. All our Senses tell us, it is Bread, and not Flesh, that we take and eat. So that we have as great Evidence that Transubstantiation is false, as the Apostles, and other Eye-Witnesses of Christ's Miracles had, that they were true and real: And we have more assurance it is false, than we have of those Miracles, for we do not see them with our own Eyes, but only have a credible Report of them; whereas we see and taste the Sacramental Elements, and those Senses assure us there is no Bodily Change therein. I desire you to tell me, how you know there is such a Sentence in the Bible, as, *This is my Body*, but that you see it there? And do you think this Evidence enough that it is there, because you see and read it there? And have you not more Evidence, that there is no Bodily Change in the consecrated Bread, than you have, that these Words, *This is my Body*, are to be found in the Bible? For you have only the Evidence of one Sense for this, but the concurring Testimony of several Senses for that. We can have no Evidence of the Truth of any thing God hath reveal'd, if our Senses, in plain sensible Matters, are not to be credited: And if they are to be credited, we have as good Grounds to believe Transubstantiation false, as we have to believe any thing God hath reveal'd to be true.

§. 6. (4.) Transubstantiation contradicts the Reason of Mankind in these Respects.

1. In respect of the Nature of a Body.
2. In respect of the Nature of a substantial Change.
3. In respect of the Nature and Use of a Miracle.

§. 7. (1.) It contradicts the Reason of Mankind about the Nature of a Body. For a Body must be in some Place, and cannot be in more Places than one at once. But if the Bread be the Body of Christ, and every piece of Bread his whole Body, and that too in all Parts of the World, where the Eucharist is Administred at the same time, and his Body be also always in Heaven, which *must retain him till the time of the Restoration of all Things*: Either there must be many Bodies of Christ (which cannot be said) or one, and the same Body must be in a Thousand Places at once, which is not one, but an heap of complicated Contradictions. For then the same Body at the same time may be wholly above it self, and wholly below it self, within and without it self, on the left Hand, and on the right Hand of it self, and round about it self; the same Body at the same time may move from it self, and lie still on the Altar, be Eat by the Priest, and not Eat by him: It may be one (that is) undivided from it self, and at the same time as far divided from it self, as *Paris* is from *Rome*, as *Tr—d* from *London*. Christ's Body was a real Human Body, and therefore could no more be in many Places at once, than the Bodies of other Men can, to whom he was *like in all Things, except Sin*. Nor will it help the Matter to say, it was a *glorify'd Body*. For the Bread is Christ's Body as *Dead*, and not as *Glorify'd*, nor doth the Glorification of a Body alter the Nature, but only the Qualities of the Body.

Heb. 4. 15.

1 Cor. 11. 26.

§. 8. (2.) Transubstantiation contradicts the Nature of a substantial Change, wherein the Thing is destroy'd, that is converted into another, and that Thing is newly produc'd, into which it is converted, and the Effects and Properties of the Thing converted cease to be perceiv'd, and only those of that Thing it is converted into are perceptible. For Instance, when our Saviour turn'd Water into Wine, the Water ceas'd to be, and Wine was produc'd a-new, and the Colour and Taste of the Water remain'd no longer, but were chang'd into the Colour and Taste of Wine. But in Transubstantiation it is not so, Bread remains

1 Cor. 10. 16,

27. & 11. 26,

27, 28.

Mat. 26. 27,

28.

Bread, being so call'd five times by St. Paul after Consecration, and the Wine *the Fruit of the Vine*, as it is call'd by our Saviour himself: Christ's Body and Blood is not newly produc'd, for then

Part II. Of Transubstantiation, &c.

7

then he would receive a new Being which he had not before, which cannot be pretended. And after all the pretended Change, the Colour and Taste of Bread and Wine remain still. And sure nothing can be more absurd, than to pretend a substantial Change, where all Circumstances are so contrary to what always accompanies a substantial Change. If they pretend a Miracle, I have in the miraculous Change of Water into Wine shew'd these Laws are observ'd, and may add that their Pretences to the contrary here,

§. 9. (3.) Contradict the reason of *Mankind as to the Nature of a Miracle*. To which two Things are necessary, that a supernatural Effect be wrought, and that this Effect be evident to Sense. And if the first be without the latter, it is, as to all the Ends and Purposes of a Miracle, as if it were not, and can be no Proof of any thing, while it needs Proof it self, that any thing Supernatural is wrought. On this Account, if Transubstantiation were true, tho' it were very Supernatural, it could be no Miracle, because there is no sensible Appearance of it. That a thing should remain in all appearance just as it was, can have no Wonder in it; and if that be a Miracle, there needs nothing but Impudence to make a thousand every Day. I proceed to consider,

§. 10. (5.) *That Transubstantiation is repugnant to Humanity*. For nothing can certainly be more inhumane, than to pretend to eat the Flesh and drink the Blood of a Man. The *Turks* upbraid *Christians* for this Doctrine as more cruel toward Christ, than the *Jews* that crucify'd him, because they pretend to devour him, and are his *Canabals* as they were his *Murderers*. When Christ spake of eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood as necessary to eternal Life, the *Jews* understanding him in this gross Sense, cry out, *This is an hard Saying, who can bear it?* And some of his Disciples were so scandaliz'd at it, that from that time they went back and walked no more with him. To remove this Scandal Christ explains himself, that the Words he had said unto them were Spirit and Life. i. e. they are not to be understood literally, but in a Spiritual Sense. And it's highly improbable, that Christ, who was so careful to prevent that gross Conception of the *Jews*, should afterward institute an oral Manducation of his Flesh. A piece of Barbarity, that humane Nature under the greatest Degeneracy could not but abhor.

§. 11. (6.) Lastly, Transubstantiation was a Doctrine not known to, much less believed by the ancient *Christians*. Which will appear from these four Considerations.

1. That

1. That the *Heathens* never object this against them:
2. That the first *Christian* Writers make such Objections against *Heathenism*.
3. And against *Hereticks*, as are inconsistent with their Belief of this.
4. *Ancient Liturgies* contain Expressions inconsistent with it.

Acts 28. 22.

§. 12. (1.) It's well known, that Christianity was a Sect at first every where *spoken against*: And that the *Heathens* spared not to load *Christianity* with all the Imputations they could find against it. They upbraided them with believing a God that was born, and that died; with believing a Resurrection and other lesser Matters, which to them seem'd absurd. But they never objected this against them, that they *made their God of Bread, and then eat him*: Which if Transubstantiation had been a Doctrin of those Times, such inquisitive and learned Heathens as *Celsus*, *Porphyry*, especially *Julian*, who was educated a Christian, and a Clergy-man, could not have been ignorant of, and would not have spar'd to expose its Absurdities, if they had known it. Their Silence then is a good Argument, that no such Doctrin was receiv'd into the Belief of that Age. (a) There is a Passage of *Irenaeus*, tho' not now in his Works, yet preserv'd by *Occumenius*, in his Comment on 1 *Pet.* c. 3. to this Purpose; that when some *Greeks* had taken the Servants of some *Christian* Catechumens (such as had never been admitted to the Sacrament) and had urg'd them by Torture to discover to them some of the Christians Secrets, they told them, that they had heard of their Masters, that the Divine Communion was the Blood and Body of Christ, thinking it was real Blood and Flesh. Upon this the *Greeks* put *Sanctus* and *Blandina* to the Torture to make them confess it. To whom *Blandina* boldly answer'd, How would they endure to do this, who by way of Exercise or Abstinence do not eat that Flesh which may law-

(a) *Occumen. Comment. in (1 Pet. 3. secundum nostram distributionem capitum) 1 Pet. 2. 12. p. 448. Edit. Paris.* Εἴτα μαθεῖν τὸ παρὰ τῶν δυνάμεων ἀπόρρητον, πρὶν χριστιανῶν ἀναγκάζουσιν, οἱ δὲ οἱ ἑτοίμοι μὴ ἔχοντες πῶς τὸ τοῖς ἀναγκάζουσιν καὶ ἡδονὴν εἶναι. παρόσον ἦσαν τῶν δειπνούντων τὴν θείαν μετέληγον αἷμα καὶ σῶμα εἶναι χρεῖσθαι, αὐτοὶ νομίσαντες τὸ ὄντως αἷμα καὶ σάρκα εἶναι, τῶ οὕτως τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσι. Οἱ δὲ λαβόντες ὡς ἀνέχομενα τῶ οὕτως ταπεινά καὶ χρεῖσθαι, καὶ δὲ τῶ οὕτως τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐλλοισιν ἐξεπόμενον, καὶ τὸς μαρτυροῦντες Σάγκλον καὶ Βλανδίναν ὁμολογῆσαι διὰ βασιλέων ἀνάγκησιν. Οἱς εὐστόχως Βλανδὶνα ἐπαρσαμένη, πῶς ἂν εἰπῶσα τῶν ἀνάγκησιν οἱ μὴ δὲ τῶν ἐπιμελούντων κρεῖων διὰ σπουδῆς ἀπαλαύουσιν.

fully

Part II. Of Transubstantiation, &c.

9

fully be eaten ; so that these *Martyrs* deny'd it as a false Accusation, that they literally eat the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament. There is no other Passage in Antiquity, that shews any such thing objected against *Christians* as Transubstantiation, and this proves it was a Calumny, and no Part of their Belief.

§. 13. (2.) The Objections made by the first Christian *Apolo-gists* against *Heathenism* shew, that they knew nothing of Transubstantiation. For,

1. They upbraid them for *Worshipping Gods of their own making*. So St. *Augustine* at large *Ironically* jeers them for their Art, which exceeded all other Inventions, by which they made the Gods they worship'd. But if he, and the Church in his time, had believ'd as the Church of *Rome* does, they would not have made such a Wonder of that Art. For your *Priests* pretend every Day to do this at the *Mafs*. They stick not to boast themselves the Creators of their Creator. *Aug. de civ. Dei l. 8. c. 24.*

§. 14. 2. They upbraided *Heathens* for *worshipping Gods, that might be stole or devour'd by Vermine*. Upon *Laban's* charging *Rachel* with stealing his Gods, says St. *Chrysostome*, A notable Fool-*Chrysost. hom. 57. in Gen.* ery! Are thy Gods such as may be stoln? Art thou not asham'd to say, *Why have ye stoln my Gods?* But would he have said this, if he had been of the Opinion of your Church, who keep the Host under Lock and Key, lest it should be stoln by Men or Vermine? *Biel. Sect. 4. in Canon. Missa.*

§. 15. 3. They upbraided *Heathens* for *worshipping Gods, that might be eaten*. How oft does *Minutius Felix* object this, that the *Heathens* sacrific'd what they worship'd, and devour'd what they ador'd? *Origen*, represents it as great Folly for some Nations to worship what others eat as Food ; sure then these Fathers never dream'd of a Corporeal Change in the Elements of the Lord's Supper, since then *Christians* would have been as absurd as *Heathens* in eating the God whom they ador'd. Hence *Averroes*, an *Arabian* Physitian, and a *Mahometan*, who liv'd about the time of the *Lateran Council*, that first decreed Transubstantiation, *A. D.* 1215. says thus. *I have travell'd over the World, and have consider'd the Religions of most Countries, and yet have found none (Christiana deteriore) worse than the Christian, quia Deum quem colunt dentibus devorant, because they tear with their Teeth that God whom they worship.*

§. 16. (3.) I come next to represent the Discourses of the antient Fathers against *Hereticks*, inconsistent with the Belief of Transubstantiation. As,

1. Against the *Manichees*, who, to prove an Opposition between the *Law* and the *Gospel*, alledg'd, that whereas in the *Gos-*

D d

pel

Contra Ad-
mantium,
c. 12.

pel Christ said, none was able to destroy the Soul of Man, the Law said, that the Soul was the Blood, which Men are able to destroy. To this St. *Augustine* answers, by explaining these Words, *The Blood is the Soul*, that its meaning is, The Blood signifies the Soul, as the *Rock is Christ*, i. e. signifies Christ. And our Saviour did not doubt to say, *This is my Body*, when he gave the Sign of his Body: Which proves this to have been St. *Augustine's* Opinion, That as the *Blood is the Soul*, and as the *Rock is Christ*, so the *Bread is Christ's Body*, not by any substantial Conversion, but by Signification of it, such as excludes a Corporeal Presence. For if St. *Augustine* had thought the Bread turn'd substantially into Christ's Body, the *Manichees* had not been press'd by this Argument, but might have fairly reply'd, that as Bread not only signify'd Christ's Body but contain'd it too, so the Blood not only signifies but contains the Soul. In St. *Augustine's* time then, the Church did not understand, *this is my Body*, in the sense of Transubstantiation.

§. 17. 2. The *Marcionites*, *Valentinians* and *Manichees*, that deny'd the reality of the Incarnation, and said, Christ had only a Body in appearance, the Fathers refuted by Arguments inconsistent with their belief of Transubstantiation. As

(a) *Tertul. de anima c. 17. p. 276. Edit. Paris. 1675.* From the evidence of Sense, which confutes a *Papist* as well as a *Marcionite*. (a)—2. They argue, that the Sacrament could not be duly styl'd, the Image, Figure, Type and Memorial of Christ's real Flesh, if he had no real Flesh and did not really suffer. When Christ said, *this is my Body*, he meant (says *Tertullian*) the Figure of my Body, and it could be no Figure of his Body, unless his Body had been true; for a Phantasme can have no Figure. Now they that thought it reasonable to believe the Testimony of our Senses, and that the Sacrament was only a sign of Christ's Body, could not believe Transubstantiation.

§. 18. 3. Against the *Encratites*, who thinking it unlawful to drink Wine, they confuted by this Argument, that Christ himself drunk Wine, and commanded Christians to drink it in the Sacrament. It is *Clemens Alexandrinus's* Argument, Be ye sure (says that Father to those Hereticks) *Christ drunk Wine*. For he blessed the Wine, and said, *Take, drink ye, this is my Blood, the Blood of the Vine*. But that the Thing which had been blessed, was Wine; he shews again, saying to his Disciples, *I will not drink of the Fruit of this Vine, till I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom*. But this Argument had been none at all, if the Wine in the Sacrament had been truly Blood and not Wine. Had Transubstantiation been known then, it would have furnish'd those

Clemens. Alex. Pedag. l. 2. c. 2. p. 158. B. Edit. Paris. 1629.

Part II. Of Transubstantiation, &c.

11

those Hereticks with a satisfactory Answer, that it was not Wine but Blood, that Christ gave his Disciples to drink in the Lord's Supper.

§. 19. (4) The Language of antient *Liturgies* is inconsistent with Transubstantiation. *Liturgies* are more exactly compos'd, than *Rhetorical Discourses*, and likely therefore to be express'd most agreeable to the Sense of the Church. And where are we more likely to find the Doctrin of the Church about the Elements of the Eucharist, than in the Prayer of Consecration, in which in the Fourth Century, they were call'd the *Types of the Body and Blood of Christ*, as (a) *St. Basil* informs us from the *Greek Liturgy*? After the Consecration by repeating the Words of the Institution, *Take, eat, this is my Body*, this Prayer is said; Part whereof I have transcrib'd in the Margin, and in which the Elements are only call'd *Antitypes of Christ's Body and Blood*, and several times it is call'd Bread after Consecration, as whoever peruses the Prayer will find.

§. 20. To conclude, if these Arguments prove Transubstantiation false, they at the same time prove the Church of Rome fallible, that teaches so gross an Error, and Idolatrous too, for requiring Divine Worship to be given to the consecrated Host, which is still a Creature, and not God.

§. 21. I beseech you therefore, Sir, to consider these things as matters of the greatest Moment, laying aside the Prejudices of your Education, and I doubt not but you will even hence alone see Reason sufficient to abandon a Communion, whose bold Impositions in Doctrins have so fatal an Influence on the Practice of its Members. For they are dangerous Absurdities, that involve all those, who blindly submit to them, in the grossest Idolatries. From which, that God would deliver you, is the Design of this Paper, and the hearty Prayer of,

(a) *Basilii Missa*. p. 41. *Bibl. patr. Edit. Paris 1624. Tom. 2.* Ἀρρύντες προσευχίζοντες τὸ ἅγιόν σου δυσκρινέως καὶ περιδύντες τὰ ἀντίτυπα τῶ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τῶ χειρὸς σου δόμῃδα, καὶ σὲ παρκαλῶμεν ἐλθεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προσκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα καὶ εὐλογῆσαι αὐτὰ καὶ ἁγιάσαι καὶ ἀναδέχεσθαι.

SIR,

Your most

Humble Servant

H. N.

D d 2

T. B's.

T. B's.

ANSWER.

§. 1. **I**N answer to your Objections against the real and substantial Presence of Christ in the blessed Eucharist: The first
 H. N. §. 3. is of no Force. For tho' these three Expressions, *I am a Vine, I am a Door, the Rock was Christ*, are figurative, yet there are several others, as that Christ was truly God, he was truly born of the Blessed Virgin *Mary*, suffer'd truly under *Pontius Pilate*, his Flesh is truly Meat, and his Blood truly Drink; which Expressions are not included in the three first; and therefore do not follow out of them, no more than it follows, Because *St. Paul* was a little Man, and *Zachens* was a little Man, therefore *Saul, Goliab*, and the Giants of the Primitive World were little Men.

§. 2. The second Objection that the real and substantial Presence of Christ is contrary to Scripture, is of no Force, because
 H. N. §. 4. instead of Scripture, Reason is alledg'd in the first Place, afterwards Instances: As first, that it is a Sacrament, which no Body questions; and that it was instituted whilst the old Law was in force. But these two Things are the Matters in dispute: Whether this Sacrament of the Blessed Eucharist is interiorly the Substance of Christ's Body, or of Bread; and whether the old Law, as to this Point of eating the Body and drinking the Blood of Christ were in force, and succeeded the Paschal Lamb, as Truth the Figure, immediately upon the Institution or no; so nothing is prov'd out of Scripture against us, unless it be contrary to Scripture not to allow a Disputant to beg the Question in debate. And tho' the Comparison of unclean Beasts, with Christ's Deify'd Body be very odious, and unfit to be mention'd: Yet not to leave *St. Peter*, we must tell you, we think we imitate him whom we take to be the first Person that acquiesced to this Divine Truth in these Words, *Lord you have the Words of Eternal Life*, when
 the

the *Jews*, some of his Disciples bogg'd at it. But it's said to be Christ's broken Body, before Christ's Body was broken, therefore, &c. Did not Christ also say, *I am with you to the end of the World*, when the end of the World was not come? Did not he say, *The Son of Man goes*, whilst he was lying at the last Supper? Men must be fine Scripturists to make such Arguments as these.

§. 3. The third Objection against the real and substantial Presence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist is of no force. Because altho' our Senses are to be credited in Christ's Miracles, so long as they are not over-rul'd by a Superior Authority, yet when they are so over-rul'd, they are not to be credited against it. St. *John Baptist* believ'd it was the Holy Ghost which appear'd under the corporeal Form of a Dove, and *Abraham* believ'd they were Angels, or the three Divine Persons, who appear'd under the Form of three Men, tho' their Senses dictated the contrary. Boat-Men are assur'd their Oars are whole, tho' upon the Curl of every Wave they seem to be broken, and Children are assur'd their Rods are straight, tho' being thrust half way into the Water they seem crooked. If we will not let Faith over-rule Sense, we shall not only cease to be Christians; if we will not let Reason also sometimes over-rule it, we shall become more Blockish than Tarpolians, and more Childish than Children.

H. N. §. 5.

Review St.
Chryl. and St.
Ambr. above-
mention'd.

§. 4. The fourth Objection against the real and substantial Presence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist is of no force, because it neither contradicts Reason in respect of the Nature of a Body, of the Nature of a substantial Change, nor of the Nature and Use of a Miracle.

H. N. §. 7.

Not in the Nature of a Body. Because according to St. *Gregory of Nissa*, St. *Chrysostome*, and St. *Austin* above-mention'd, a Body may by the Divine and Miraculous Power of God be in Heaven, and upon Earth, in the Hands of innumerable Priests, and in the Mouths of innumerable People, in it self, and in its own Hands, at the same time. And these Fathers were as great Philosophers, and as unwilling to contradict Reason, as we are. A certain Friend of *Job* call'd *Eliu*, being full of his own Imagination, and ready to burst with the Vapours of Self-conceit, had undertaken to Dispute, as he thought, very wisely and sublimely of the Wisdom and Power of God. By whom he was advis'd to gird his Loins like a Man, that is, to carry himself tightly, and manage his Weapons dexterously when he enter'd into such a List. And without doubt no weaker Arms than an evident Contradiction, and Implicance are sufficient for such an Engagement.

Job 32.v.28.

ment, and the light Management of them should be a good Definition of an Implicance, and an unquestionable bringing of the Particulars up to it; but here's neither such a Definition, nor any Thing of a due Application of it, yet an heap of Contradictions pretended, but such a heap as no Pigmy, either in Divinity or Philosophy needs fear stumbling at. Would not it have been better to have hearken'd to the Advice of the Learn'd, and moderate Prelate, Bishop *Forbes*, which he delivers in these Words? *There are Protestants, who very dangerously, and too baldly deny that God can change Bread into the Body of our Lord. For God can do many Things above the Comprehension of Man, yea, and of Angels. That such Things as involve Contradiction cannot be done, all grant, Because 'tis to no Man evident what the Essence of every Thing in Particular is, and what implies Contradiction; 'tis certainly great Rashness by Reason of the weakness of our poor Souls, to prescribe Limits to God, and Insolently to deny, that by his Omnipotence he can do this or that: And (p. 395.) Certainly we all believe many Things, which if Human Reason be consulted, seem no less impossible, nor less to involve manifest Contradiction than Transubstantiation.*

H. N. § 8.

§. 5. Neither contradicts it Reason in respect of a substantial Change. For many according to St. *Cyril*, and St. *Ambrose*, have been wrought by the same Omnipotence of God: Against which, instead of an Implicance, is alledg'd an Example of a substantial Change, to overthrow a substantial Change. A strange way of arguing against Omnipotence! But the Blessed Eucharist is call'd Bread by St. *Paul*, and Blood by our Saviour himself after the Consecration. And was not a Serpent call'd a Rod, when it was a Serpent, because it had lately been a Rod? Was not Wine call'd Water, when it was Wine, because it had lately been Water? But they put on new Accidents, and Qualifications when they were chang'd. What then, must the Omnipotence of God be driven like a Pack-Horse always in the same Road? Or is it oblig'd to invest every Substance at all times in its proper dress of Accidents, any more than it was oblig'd to create *Adam* and *Eve* in their Cloaths? If so, why had not Christ's sacred Humanity, its own Figure and Lineaments, when it appear'd to St. *Mary Magdalen*, and the two Disciples going to *Emmaus*? Or was their Eyes and Senses deceiv'd contrary to that dangerous Argument of Sense? St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* informs us, That Christ in the Blessed Eucharist would Administer his Flesh and Blood to us under the appearance of Bread and Wine, out of Condescendence to our Infirmities, lest we should abhor the Sight of Flesh and Blood upon the Tables of the Church; and must we argue against his Flesh and Blood, because they are not under

*Tract. 10. in
Joan.*

der their own appearance, and have not all their Accidents and Qualifications, at least to our Sight? This would be a very Pettish way of Quarrelling, not only with God's Wisdom and Omnipotence, but also with our own Happiness.

§. 6. Neither contradicts it Reason in respect of Use and Nature of a Miracle, which being no more, according to the vulgar and usual Signification, than what is wonderful, nor according to the special and singular Signification, more than what surpasses the Course and Power of Nature; what Authority has any particular Person to limit it further? St. Chrysostome above-mention'd, cries up the Blessed Eucharist as such for a singular Miracle, in that, by means thereof the Body of Christ which is in Heaven naturally, is in the Hands and Mouths of Priests and People all over the Earth, tho' it be not perceiv'd by Sense, tho' it seems contrary not only to the Information of our Eyes, but even of our Reason. Therefore there needs no Reflection of Impudence, not only upon all the Catholick Church since the Council of *Lateran*, but even upon St. Chrysostome, who liv'd above Eight Hundred Years before it: And had it been well consider'd how far this random Bolt might have flown, and upon what a venerable Person it might pitch, perhaps it would not been Shot so hastily. Calvin, tho' none of the most Timorous Men, was more Circumspect in those Words: *We affirm that Christ descends to us, not so much by the exterior Symbol, as by his Spirit, that he may truly enliven our Souls by the Substance of his Flesh. He that does not perceive there are many Miracles compris'd in these few Words is more than Blockish.* Yet there's no miraculous Change appears to Sense as is alledg'd, unless Impudence make them

§. 7. Behold we are now past the sharp-edg'd Weapons of Contradiction, and have only the dull Tools of Repugnance to encounter, which if they were to be fear'd in Matters of Religion, farewell Divine Faith, which captivates imperious Reason into Obedience, and reluctant Inclination into Subjection. But that there is any Repugnance to Nature in the real and substantial Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Blessed Eucharist is what's deny'd; and therefore

§. 8. The fifth Objection against it is of no force. To eat the Flesh of Christ in the Jewish and Capharnaitical Sense, that is, by Piece-meal, and as Flesh is Sold in the Shambles, accordingly as St. Chrysostome and St. Austin understood their Meaning, when they said, *How can this Man give us his Flesh to Eat*, is horrible according to St. Cyril above-mention'd, but to Eat it under the appearance of Bread, is neither horrible nor repugnant to Nature.

ture.

ture. The Prayer made to *Jupiter*, by the two famous Friends of Antiquity, that he would make them both into one, and unite them in Heart, Soul, and Body, as they were in Affection, was never look'd upon as horrible, or repugnant to Nature, but on the contrary as an admirable Transport of a generous Love and Friendship. What those two Friends only pray'd for, Christ has by means of this Mystery affected according to those Words

Homil. 46. in Jo. of St. Chrysostome, It is effected by that Meat which he has given us, that we are converted into that Flesh, not only in Affection, but in Reality. For having a mind to shew his Love to us, he has mix'd himself with us, and reduc'd us into one with himself by means of his Body, to the end the Body might be united with the Head. For this is what becomes those who Love in Perfection. This is what Job signify'd of his Servants, by whom he was Lov'd in Perfection, who to express their Love for him, said, Who will grant us our Desire, that we may be fill'd with his Flesh? This is what Christ did in effect, that he might bind us to him in a stronger Union of Charity, and that he might manifest his Love to us, permitting himself not only to be seen by us, but touch'd, tasted, eaten and fill'd with the Love of him. Let us therefore rise from this Table like Lyons, breathing Fire terrible to the Devils, &c. Who would be afraid to be esteem'd a Canibal by an Arabian Averroes, or Turkish Mahometan, upon Condition he might be thus united, and inflam'd with the Love of God with St. Chrysostome?

§. 9. Having past the sharp-edg'd Weapons of Contradiction, and the dull Tools of Repugnance, without being so much as touch'd by them in this Point of the real and substantial Presence of Christ in the Eucharist; we come to the sixth and last Objection. After which, I must confess I shall never be surpriz'd at any that ever I meet with hereafter. The Objection is, That such Presence was not known to, much less believ'd by Antiquity. Modest Persons when they are ask'd their Sentiments concerning Negatives, unless they have Demonstrations, and irresistible Proofs, are us'd to answer that they are not, as far as their Knowledge reaches.

§. 10. Let's see now what Demonstration or irresistible Proof is brought, to support a Negative for Sixteen Hundred and Fifty Years before the Objector had any Knowledge at all. The real and substantial Presence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist was not known to, much less believ'd by Antiquity. Was the great Council of *Lateran*, the Councils of *Tours*, *Vercells*, *Rome*, *Francford*, and the second of *Nice* so very lately, some of them being of Five, some of Six, some of Nine Hundred Years Date? To leave the rest of the Fathers to your farther Consideration:
Are

Are St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Chrysostome, and St. Cyprian, whom the Century-Writers of Magdeburg, cent. 4. c. 10. Oecolampadius, Peter Martyr, &c. own to have holden Transubstantiation; are these, I say, yesterday Gentlemen, that have no Pretence to Antiquity? But to recover my self out of my Surprize, and come to see what Proofs are brought to support a Negative for Sixteen Hundred and Fifty Years before the Objectors were Born.

§. 11. First, Its alledg'd that the *Heathens* objected nothing H. N. §. 12. against *Christianism* upon this Account. No wonder since the Primitive Christians following our Saviour's Advice of not *throwing Pearls before Hogs*, conceal'd this greatest of them all from them, with singular Circumspection, as is plain, *Athanas. Apolog. 11. Cyril Jerus. Catech. 6. Epit. Hæresi 42. Bas. l. de Sp. St. Theodoret in Dialog. Chrysost. and Aug. Post.* Whether *Julian* the Apostate objected any Thing or no, is unknown; two of his three Books being entirely lost, and only the remainders of the third in St. Cyril of Alexandria's Confutation; wherein he professes expressly to pass several Things, lest he should offend Christ by *exposing* to the Prophane the Secrets of our Religion, and giving Holy Things to Dogs. You certainly were very Unfortunate in pitching upon that Example mention'd by *Oecumenius*, as out of St. Irenæus. For that shews that Heathens and Persecutors, no less Ancient than the first, or at least the beginning of the second Age did not only object, but tortur'd People of this Belief. And the Christian Servants, who, whether they were Baptiz'd or no, you whip over upon the Bridge of a *Parenthesis*, which must be look'd after as soon as *Oecumenius* can be met with; those Christian Servants, I say, either were Baptiz'd, and had this Truth of substantial Presence of Christ's Presence from their Masters; or they were not Baptiz'd, and consequently this Mystery according to the Practice of the Primitive Church was conceal'd from them. If they were Baptiz'd, and own'd it: Behold then it was not only known, but believ'd and taught in the very first Centuries of *Christianism*? If they were not Baptiz'd, they could not pretend to deliver what they knew not, and their Persecutors only went upon Suspicion, as *Cecilinus*, against whom writes *Minutius*, in these Words; *Why do the Christians endeavour so much to hide, whatsoever it is that they Worship so privately?* To which both he, *Tertul. Apol. c. 7.* And *Origen. l. 1. contra Celsum* answers them as St. *Justus* and *Blandina* did, by evading, not denying an odious Question, which alone to any serious Man is a thousand times better Proof for the Affirmative, than such poor Appearances as are objected, are against such a long-winded Negative.

H. N. §. 13.

§. 12. But the Father objected such Arguments against *Heathens*, as might have been retorted upon themselves, if they had believ'd the real and substantial Presence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist. Might not their Arguments have been retorted also, when they objected that the *Heathens* worship'd dead Men for Gods? Did they therefore forbear? No: They might say with their Master St. Paul; *We Preach Christ Crucify'd, a Scandal to the Jews, and a Folly to the Gentiles, but to the Call'd of God, both Jews and Gentiles the Power and Wisdom of God.* But there was less danger of having their Arguments retorted upon account of the real Presence, which was conceal'd from the *Heathens*, than upon the account of the Passion which was Preach'd to them, therefore there's no appearance of Reason that the latter should withhold them. For as St. Paul had an Answer against the *Heathens* Retortion in these Words, *Altho' he was Crucify'd on the account of Infirmary, he Lives on the account of the Vertue of God;* In which Sense Tertullian tells also the *Heathens* they might believe, if they would, what seem'd disgraceful in our Religion, provided they would believe what was Glorious in it likewise: So the Fathers might securely object and revile the Death, Captivity, locking up, stealing and devouring the Heathen Gods, because the *Heathens* had no Proof of their Immortality, Resurrection, Adorableness, Impassibility, &c. which the Fathers had ready of Christ's Body, if there had been occasion for it. And that the ancient Fathers ador'd, tho' they reserv'd with great Care the Blessed Eucharist, besides the Testimony of St. Austin already alledg'd, be pleas'd to Read St. Cyprian *de Lapsis*. Tert. *Apol.* St. Amb. *l. de Sp. S.* St. Chrysost. *hom. 24. in 1 Cor.* St. Greg. *Naz. in Epitaph Gorg.* and St. Denis the *Araop. Eccl. Hist. c. 27.*

H. N. §. 16.

§. 13. But the Fathers us'd Arguments against Hereticks, which in the Sense of substantial Presence would be of no force; as when St. Augustine arguing against *Adimantus* a *Manichean*, says, Blood is the Soul, that is, a Sign of the Soul; as our Saviour said, *This is my Body*, when he gave the Sign of his Body. But does not the Blood contain the Soul, tho' it signifies the Soul? Why then may not the Blessed Eucharist contain our Saviour's Body, as to the interior Part, tho' it signifies the same Body as to the exterior Part? And if, according to the same Father in the same Place, against the same Heretick, the Soul is not kill'd when the Blood is spill'd, why should the glorify'd, and impassible Body of Christ, be thought, as is above objected, to be disgrac'd or prejudic'd when the exterior Sign of it in the Blessed Sacrament is only abus'd? Those are in great want of Arguments who are forc'd to make use of such as overthrow their

their Cause. What follows concerning the *Marcionites*, *Valentinians* and *Manichees*, being urg'd only to prove we are to believe our Senses, how far it is to be allow'd is already answer'd. What's alledg'd out of *St. Clement of Alexandria*, If he calls the Eucharist Wine, and the Blood of the Grape after Consecration, its no more than *Moses* did in calling the Serpent a Rod, or than *St. John* did in calling the Wine Water. And the Encratites abhorring Wine by reason of its ill Effects in those who abus'd it, as well as the *Manichees*, *St. Clement's* Argument is good against them, because the Effects following Accidents and Qualities, and not the Substance, the Qualities together with their Effects of Wine remain'd after the Consecration, tho' the Substance did not. And they were good, and might be well us'd, as the Example of Christ proves very well. But *St. Basil* calls the Eucharist after the Words of Consecration a Type; so indeed do all the *Roman* Catholicks that ever I heard of, call it a visible Sign of invisible Grace. But whether this Type, or visible Sign contain interiorly and invisibly what it represents visibly and exteriorly, is the Thing to be prov'd and not suppos'd, and I hope its done sufficiently in the above-mention'd Arguments.

§. 14. To conclude with you in Words and Prayers, answerable to your own; If these Arguments do not prove Transubstantiation false, they do not prove the Church of *Rome* Fallible, which teaches the reveal'd Truth of a real and substantial Presence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist, and requires Divine Worship to be given to the consecrated Host, which *St. Austin* above-mention'd declares, cannot be refus'd without Sin and Impiety.

§. 15. I beseech you therefore, Sir, to consider these Things, as Matters of the greatest Moment, laying aside the prejudices of Education, and I doubt not but you will even hence alone see Reason sufficient to abandon a Communion, whose bold Impositions, and (according to *St. Austin*) impious Doctrins have so fatal an Influence on the Practice of its Members; for its a dangerous Infidelity that involves all those, that give way to it, in the grossest Impiety. From which that God would deliver you is the Design of this Paper, and the Hearty Prayer of

S I R,

Your most Humble Servant,

T. B.

§. 16. **I** Beg your Pardon for sending you the first foul Draught in this blotted Paper, and hope you'll Excuse it upon the Account, I had neither Time, nor Health, being something Indispos'd, to draw it fair. I likewise beg you'll not let it pass out of your Hands till you have given me Time to Review it, and Satisfy you farther, if you find any Material Matter in your Objections out of Haste omitted. For altho' you may be convinc'd of my Haste, perhaps others may not.

A REPLY

A
R E P L Y
T O
T. B's. A N S W E R,
T O
H. N's. F I R S T P A P E R
A G A I N S T
T R A N S U B S T A N T I A T I O N.

§. 1. **M**Y first Argument against Transubstantiation was, T. B. S. N. That the Words, *This is my Body*, is no better Proof of it, than *I am a Vine, the Rock is Christ*. What does T. B. return for Answer? Why? Tho' those are, there are other Expressions in the Scripture that are not Figurative. And what follows thence? But that, *This is my Body*, may be Figurative, or not Figurative for what T. B. pretends to prove. Sure it does not follow that all Scripture must be understood Literally, because some must. For then *the Rock is Christ*, must import a Transubstantiation. And if some Scripture must be taken Figuratively, there is no absolute Necessity of taking these Words, *This is my Body*, Literally. Christ says, *I am the*

S. N. C.

true Vine. What glorying had there been had he said, *This is my true Body*? And yet if he had said so, this as well as that Expression might have been taken figuratively. I desire *T. B.* here to consider, how common this sacramental *Metonymie* is in the Scriptures. In Eating the *Paschal Lamb*, the *Jews* say, *This is the Lord's Passover*: In Eating the bitter Herbs, they say, *These are the bitter Herbs which our Fathers did Eat in the Wilderness*. Did they thereby mean a Transubstantiation or a Commemoration only? *Circumcision* is call'd the *Covenant*, which was only the Seal of it. And in *Pharaoh's Dream*, the *seven Cows* are call'd *seven Years*. And if figurative Expressions are so common about such Matters, what necessity can there be of excluding a Figure from Christ's Institution? Nay, the other part of this Institution is unavoidably figurative. The *Cup* is the *new Testament* only by a sacramental *Metonymie*, and not by any substantial Change: And what Reason can there be to deny such a sacramental *Metonymie* of the *Bread*? Let *T. B.* consider what *St. Chrysostome* says on those Words, *The Rock is Christ*; and then tell me seriously, whether his Words do not sound more for a real and substantial Presence of Christ in the *Rock*, than all he hath cited out of him concerning the Eucharist. *The Rock was Christ.* It was not (says he) the Nature of the *Rock* that sent out the *Water*, but another spiritual *Rock* that did all the Work, i. e. *Christ*, who was present ev'ry where with them, and did all the wonderful Works. If without reflection on the Father's Ingenuity, *T. B.* can interpret this Passage without a Transubstantiation of the *Rock* into Christ, I may do the like of *this is my Body*. And my first Argument remains unshaken (I may say truly, untouched) That *this is my Body* is no proof of Transubstantiation. I desire *T. B.* in his next to tell me, why he does not acknowledge this as well as many other learned *Papists* do, or what Answer he gives to their Testimony, if he think fit to dissent from it? Or at least not to take it ill if I hereafter give no more Deference to *Dr. Forbe's* Authority, than he does to theirs.

Vol. 9. Hom.
22. in 1 Cor.
p. 525. Edit.
Commel.
1603.

§. 2. (2.) My second Argument is, That Transubstantiation is not only not Countenanc'd by, but Repugnant to this Scripture, *This is my Body*. But for this says *T. B.* Not Scripture, but Reason is produc'd. And is it not a very proper Method to produce Reasons to prove, That those Words cannot be understood in the Sense of Transubstantiation? And if I have prov'd by good Reason, That those Words are repugnant to Transubstantiation, Have not I prov'd Transubstantiation contrary to Scripture?

T. B. §. 2.

If

If indeed my Reasons had been what *T. B.* Misrepresents them, I should be ashamed to call them Good, as he ought to be for Misrepresenting me. Where do I argue, That Transubstantiation is contrary to Scripture, because the Eucharist is a Sacrament? What is this but a Man of Straw *T. B.* hath made himself, to shew his Dexterity in beating it in Pieces? Where do I argue, That Transubstantiation is contrary to Scripture, because the Eucharist was Instituted while the Old Law was in force? It's easie to make silly Arguments, and then answer them; but then *T. B.* answers himself, not me.

§. 3. My Arguments then under this Head were these, which that *T. B.* may not over-look them again, I will mention distinctly, and illustrate a little. *This is my Body* cannot signify Transubstantiation.

(1. Because it is a gross Absurdity to suppose Christ had his whole entire Body in his Hand, and gave it to his Disciples, and yet kept it whole to himself. This *T. B.* hath not touch'd. In his Testimonies out of the Fathers, the Passage out of *St. Augustine* on *Ps. 33.* may perhaps be intended against this by *T. B.* but how little to his purpose, I have shew'd in my Answer to it. And that he may the better comprehend it, I will illustrate it by an Instance. Suppose a Testator having his Will in his Hand, and reaching it to his intended Heir, should say, *Take this, it is my House.* Would it not be absurd to say, The Testator meant this Paper is my House made of Brick and Timber? And would it not be a good Reason against that absurd Interpretation, That in that literal Sense, it was impossible for him to hold his House in his Hand? I may add, since Christ as a Testator (so *T. B.* urges it) said, *This is my Body*: If he understood it in the Sense of Transubstantiation, why did he not Explain himself, and answer these so obvious Objections, which *T. B.*'s own Rule supposes should have been done according to Sincerity and Ingenuity.

§. 4. (2. If these Words *This is my Body*, are to be understood strictly according to the Letter, then the same recited by *St. Paul.* *This is my Body which is broken for you*, must be understood as strictly too. But how without a Figure could his Body at the Institution be said to be broken, since it was not broken till afterward at his Passion? This was my Argument, and all *T. B.* says to it, is the citation of two or three figurative Expressions which does his Cause no Service, but confirms my Argument, That the Words of Institution are to be taken figuratively.

§. 5. (3. I propos'd a very plain Instance to prove ours a more easie and obvious Sense of these Words, than that of Transubstantiation. And in hopes that T. B. will take notice of it, I will repeat it. If a Man pointing at the King's Person, say, *This is the King*, the plain literal Sense would be, *This is the King's Person*; but if pointing at the Picture he should say, *This is the King*, the plain literal Sense would be, *This is the King's Picture*. Likewise had Christ laid his Hand upon his Breast and said, *This is my Body*, it must have been understood of his substantial Body; but when being about to institute a Sacrament, he takes Bread, blesses and breaks it, and then giving it to his Disciples, says, *Take, Eat, This is my Body*; the most plain and obvious Sense is, *This is the Sacrament of my Body*. And after this I hope T. B. will no longer pretend to urge us with a literal Sense, since that is so plainly for Us and against Him.

§. 6. (4. I added as a probable Argument, That the Disciples never dreamed of Transubstantiation when Christ said, *This is my Body*, since they make no Scruple at Eating and Drinking what Christ gave them. Whereas had they imagin'd that he had commanded them to drink real Blood, so directly contrary to the Law of *Moses*, not then antiquated, it is probable they would have bogg'd at it, as St. Peter did at Eating unclean Beasts, tho' commanded in a Vision. All T. B's Answer to this, is a grave Exclamation at an odious comparison of Christ to unclean Beasts, whereas if he would observe, I only compare Eating of Blood to Eating unclean Beasts as equally abominable to a Jew, and the one as like to have been scrupled by St. Peter as the other, if he had suspected a Transubstantiation. But not to leave St. Peter thus in the lurch, T. B. will have something to say, tho' nothing to his purpose. *We think (says he) that we imitate him whom we take to be the first Person that acquiesc'd to this Divine Truth in those Words. Lord thou hast the Words of eternal Life, when the Jews, even some of his Disciples, bogg'd at it.* But to my Thoughts St. Peter clearly disclaims the gross Sense of oral Manducation in those Words, giving the reason why he would not forsake Christ, for what he had taught of Eating his Flesh and Drinking his Blood, because he knew it was meant of his Doctrin receiv'd by Faith, *thou hast the Words of eternal Life*; and when we believe thy Word we eat thy Flesh and drink thy Blood to eternal Life. And I desire T. B. to give me a fair Answer to this Argument. Jo. 6. 54. Christ saith, *Whoso Eateth my Flesh and Drinketh my Blood, hath eternal Life.* Can this be true of the Eucharist in the Sense of Transubstantiation? Doth not the Wicked as well as the Faithful, according to

to the Church of Rome, eat Christ's Flesh and drink his Blood? And will T. B. say they have eternal Life, whom St. Paul thinks *Eat and Drink their own Damnation*? How then can this be understood of the Eucharist and an oral Manducation, in which Sense the Words are not true? Learn then of St. Peter to understand them aright for believing the Doctrine of Christ's *Incar-nation* and *Passion* to eternal Life. And herein you will not only follow your own Cardinal Cajetan in his Comment on Jo. 6. but also St. Augustine l. 3. de doct. Chris. *To Eat the Flesh of Christ* (says he) *is a Figure teaching us to partake of Christ's Passi-on, and to imprint in our Memories with Delight and Profit, that Christ was Crucify'd for us.*

§. 7. And now before I proceed, I desire it may be observ'd, That I have prov'd first that Transubstantiation is no part of reveal'd Religion, before I produc'd Arguments against it from Sense and Reason. For this shews the Absurdity of flying to God's Omnipotence, and the Obsequiousness of Faith for that which is no matter of Faith, and about which God hath no where declar'd that he will over-rule Nature.

§. 8. In a Word, When a Doctrine is propos'd and Scripture cited for it, if it seem to oppose Sense and Reason and include manifold Contradictions, and if a more rational Interpretation of those Scriptures may be found out, whereby all those Incon-veniences are avoided; it is very reasonable that we embrace that rational Sense, and it is unreasonable to charge us with op-posing the Testimony of Sense to the Word of God; when we only oppose it to a nonsensical Interpretation thereof. Which premis'd, I proceed,

§. 9. (3.) To vindicate my third Argument against Transub-stantiation, that the Truth of Christian Religion stands or falls with the Credibility of the Testimony of Sense. Sure T. B. does not think us all so ignorant, as not to know that our Senses may deceive us, when the Organ or Medium is not duly dispos'd: And I thought I had prevented his childish trifling Objections from the Tarpawlin's Oar and the Child's Stick; when in my former Paper I declar'd, That we spake of *the concurring Testi-mony of our Senses in plain sensible Matters.* I dare say T. B. knows well enough, that we suppose the Organs must be right-ly dispos'd, conversant about their proper Objects, placed at a due distance, and receiving their Impressions thro' proper Me-diums; and that we have leisure enough to examine them, and all Senses agree in their Testimony, when we affirm that the Testimony of our Senses ought to be credited, and that they do not, cannot deceive us. Now the contrary Assertion to this, I

T. B. §. 3.

have prov'd destroys the evidence of Miracles, and the certainty of those Matters of fact on which our Christian Faith depends; and T. B. hath not said one Word to disprove me. He supposes indeed that God over-rules our Senses in the particular Case of Transubstantiation; but that is the very Thing we deny, and he ought to prove. Nay, I say if he should prove it, he would overthrow all moral Certainty of Divine Revelation. I desir'd him to tell me, how we could be sure, these Words, *This is my Body*, are to be found in the Holy Scriptures, if our Senses are not credible. Not a Word that he answers to it. I alludg'd Christ's Appeal to the Senses of *John's* Disciples for the Truth of what they heard and saw, and to the Senses of his own Disciples about his Resurrection, *Handle me, and see me*; desiring *Papists* to resolve me, whether our Saviour put the Matter upon a sure way of Trial or no. If he did, by the same way of trial Transubstantiation appears to be false. I urg'd the Inconsistency of the Apostles, (and I may add all ancient Apologists for Christianity) way of proving Christianity in the general to be true, by Arguments that oblige us to believe our Senses; if they had recommended one particular Doctrin that requires us to disbelieve our Senses, the concurring Testimony of all our Senses in a plain sensible Matter, which were to undo all they had said for Christianity in general. In a Word, I argued that we have more Evidence to believe Transubstantiation to be false, than we have to believe the Christian Religion to be true, by how much certainty of Sense is more than moral Certainty. But as if T. B. cared not what became of the Christian Religion in its Contest with *Infidels*, provided Transubstantiation be maintain'd against *Protestants*, he says not one Word to clear these Difficulties, or justify the Reasonableness of our Faith against these Objections. He offers indeed two or three Instances to prove our Senses may be mistaken; which if to the purpose, Confirm rather than Invalidate the Objection. For if the proof of divine Revelation depend on the certainty of our Senses, the more Instances he produces of the Deceivableness of our Senses, the more he says to strengthen the *Infidel's* Cause, and enervate the Proofs of *Christianity*. However to let him see we have a Zeal for our Christian Faith, whatever becomes of Transubstantiation, I will examine his Instances, and prove that none of them invalidates the Credibility of our Senses in plain sensible Matters, as above stated.

S. 10. 1. Says T. B. *St. John Baptist believ'd, it was the Holy Ghost which appear'd under the corporeal form of a Dove.* And what then? We believe Christ's Spiritual Presence under the Elements.

Elements of Bread and Wine. Were the *Baptist's* Senses deceiv'd here at all? Did they represent the Appearance to be really a Dove or only the form of a Dove, or an aerial Body formed into that shape? There were then no Accidents of a Body without a bodily Substance; but the Substance of an aerial Body (which was the object of the *Baptist's* Senses) influenc'd by the Holy *Ghost*, which was the object of his Faith. Just as in the Eucharist the Substance of Bread and Wine, is the object of our Senses, and the Body and Blood of Christ spiritually receiv'd, the object of our Faith. But

§. 11. 2. Says *T. B.* Abraham believ'd the three Men to be Angels, tho' his Senses represented them to be Men. I answer, Those Angels either assum'd real Bodies or they did not. If the first, *Abraham's* Senses did not deceive him; if the latter, I desire *T. B.* to prove that *Abraham* did Handle and Examine the Consistence of those Apparitions. For if he had not the help of all those Senses that were capable of assisting in the search, he could not positively pronounce the Senses Judgment in that Case. If *Abraham* try'd them by all proper Senses, he either found them to have real, solid Bodies, or not. If the latter, then he was satisfy'd by his other Senses, that they were not Men, as his Sight at first inform'd him: If the former, and his Senses assur'd him that they had real solid Bodies, it remains that *T. B.* prove they did not assume such Bodies. For if they did assume real Bodies, *Abraham's* Senses were not deceiv'd, but faithfully perform'd their Office: Which was not to determine whether the Bodies of those Angels were assum'd or natural, but whether they had true Bodies or no. *Tertull. de carne Christi. c. 9.* When *Marcion* had us'd the same Objection that *T. B.* here does from the appearances of Angels to *Abraham* and *Lot*, he answers, *Know that this is not granted, neither that those Angels, had only seeming Flesh, but of a true, solid, human Substance.*

The Testimonies of *St. Chrysostome* and *St. Ambrose* have been consider'd in their proper Places, and shew'd not at all to favour their Sentiments, that invalidate the Testimony of our Senses. And I shall have occasion hereafter to vindicate *Tertullian*, and others appealing to the Testimony of our Senses for the reality of Christ's Body against the *Marcionites* and *Valentinians*.

§. 12. As to *T. B's.* Oars and Tarpaulins, I refer him to *St. Augustine* for an Answer. *If one think that an Oar is broken in the Water, and when it is taken out of the Water, made whole again, August. de re he has not a bad Report, but he is an ill Judge. For the Eye according to its Nature, neither ought, nor could perceive it otherwise while c. 33.*

in the Water: For if the Air is a different Medium from the Water, it must perceive it one way in the Air, and another in the Water. Therefore the Eye sees rightly, for it was made only to see, but the Mind judges amiss.

§. 13. (4.) My next Argument was from the Contradictions that are in Transubstantiation to Reason, in respect of the Nature of a Body, a substantial Change, and a Miracle.

T. B. §. 4.

(1.) As to the first, T. B. refers to the Authority of Gregory Nyssene, St. Chrysostome, and St. Augustine, which I have already examin'd and shew'd to make nothing against us, or for him. He next checks my Presumption with the Example of Elibu, as if I were Disputing against God, when I first prov'd that God never taught Transubstantiation, and then disputed for him against such as he, that would Father their own Absurdities on him, and call in his Omnipotence to reconcile their Contradictions.

§. 14. Then T. B. calls on me for a Definition of a Contradiction. And to speak the Truth, I thought it would have been a Disparagement to such Masters in School-Divinity as Popish Priests pretend to be, should I have blotted Paper with a Logical Definition. And instead of that I desire T. B. to prove whether what I mention be not Contradictions according to his Notions thereof.

Such is the Nature of a Body, that it must be in a determinate Space. If then it can be in more than one distinct Spaces at once, it may be above it self, and below it self, *i. e.* not above it self. Is that a Contradiction or no? It may be in Heaven, and on the Earth at the same time, *i. e.* not in Heaven. It must be a Body, finite and limited to Space, and no finite Body, nor limited to Space. And are these Contradictions? In a Word, I desire T. B. to tell me and the World whether these be not Contradictions? That there should be length, and nothing long; breadth, and nothing broad; thickness, and nothing thick; roundness, and nothing round; whiteness, and nothing white; moisture, and nothing moist; fluidity, and nothing fluid. That the same Thing, the one and self same Body of Christ at the same time should move to, and from it self, and lie still too, or that it should be carry'd thro' one Place to another, thro' the middle Space, and yet not move: That it should be brought from Heaven to Earth, and yet not come out of Heaven: That to be one is to be undivided from it self: And yet that one, and the same Thing should be divided from it self: That a finite Thing can be in all Places at once: These, and many such like are the acknowledg'd Consequences of Transubstantiation; and I desire

I desire *T. B.* to give me his Opinion, whether they do not seem Contradictions to him, as they do to me.

§. 15. But at length I am attack'd with the Authority of *Dr. Forbes* to reprimand my Presumption in charging *Popery* with Contradictions, and that it falls not under the Power of Omnipotence to reconcile all the Contradictions of Transubstantiation. But what he cites out of him, it will be time enough for me to Answer, when *T. B.* hath assur'd me, that he will stand to his Authority: When he lets me know what Deference he gives to *Erasmus* declaring Transubstantiation both Name and Thing unknown to the ancient Fathers; or when he is agreed with *Forbes*, that Transubstantiation hath no Foundation either in Scripture or Fathers. And provided you will renounce Transubstantiation, I will make all the allowances that I can, without prejudice to Truth, for Peace sake; tho' I dare not with *Dr. Forbes* sacrifice any Truth to the best Design in the World. But to let you see I reject not *Forbes's* without better Authority, it may be observ'd that many Fathers mention this as the Character of the old Hereticks, that they were wont to urge God's Omnipotence to Countenance and give a Colour to their own absurd Figments. Thus *Gregory Nazianzen* says of the *Apollinarians*, *Orat. 42.* That being press'd by these Reasonings, they fly to this, That to God it is possible. And when *Praxeas* betook himself to the same Subterfuge, *Tertullian* gives this excellent Answer. *If we may so abruptly use this Sentence (that to God all Things are easy) in our Presumptions, we may then feign any Thing we please of God; as if he had done a Thing because he was able to do it. But because God can do all Things, we are not to believe that he has done, that which he has not done, but we are to enquire whether he has done it or no.* And *Clemens Alexandrinus* affirms, That the Almighty will Effect nothing that is Absurd. And *Origen*, When we say, God can do all proper Things, we know how to understand all Things, not of such Things as cannot Exist, or are Unintelligible. And on these Authorities I may with less Impudence Charge you with the Absurdities of Transubstantiation, than you are guilty of in endeavouring to Father them on God's Omnipotence. *Strom. l. 4. c. 10. Cont. Praxeas*

§. 16. To conclude this Head, I Request of *T. B.* not to pass over what I now propose without Notice (as usually he does the Strength of my Arguments) but to help me to solve this Difficulty. Suppose a Priest Consecrates an Host at *London*, and another Priest Consecrates another at *Rome*; Is the same Body of Christ, that is present at *London*, by virtue of the Consecration at *London*, and at *Rome* at the same time by virtue of that Consecration that was made at *London*? If so, what doth that other
Con-

Consecration at *Rome* produce? If not, then the Presence of Christ's Body is limited to that individual Host, where that Consecration is made; and its Supernatural way of Existence does not take away its Relation to Place, or to a determinate Space. If I understand you, every Consecration hath its distinct Effect, and the Priest who Consecrates at *London* turns the Host, not into the Body, that is at *Rome*, but the Priest at *Rome* does that. Sure then the Body of Christ at *London* must be different from that at *Rome*, and Christ have as many Bodies as there happen to be Consecrations at the same time thro' all the World. And then I cannot avoid those Contradictions, that the same Body is one, and not one, divided from it self, and not divided.

§. 17. Nay, I have a further Scruple in this Matter, to which I desire T. B's. Solution. When the consecrated Host is broken, is it broken into Parts, or into Wholes? If you say the latter, I desire to know whether it be not Nonsense in the Church of *Rome*, as it is certainly among all the rest of Mankind, to talk of dividing a Thing into Wholes? Before I leave this Point, I have some Testimonies out of the Fathers to prove, that Christ's Body cannot be in more Places than one. The first is out of *Arnobius*, where he thus argues against the Gentiles. The Gods dwell in their Representations: But do they dwell there in such a manner that each of them is entire in each Statue? Or are they there divided, and by Parts? Certainly neither one, and the same God can be at the same time in several Statues, neither can he be cut into Parts by Division. Suppose we in Effect there are in the World ten Thousand Representations of *Vulcan*, can this God be (as I have already said) in these ten Thousand Places at a time? I do not believe it: Why not? Because that which of its own Nature is singular, cannot multiply its self in conserving its Simplicity and Unity; much less if what you believe be true, that the Gods have an Human Shape. For neither the Hand separated from the Head, nor the Foot divided from the rest of the Body does make the whole Person, for you must not say the Parts have the same Effect as the whole, seeing the whole cannot subsist, but by the Union of its Parts. Now if it be said that this God is wholly entire in each Statue, the Truth loses all its Strength, seeing its suppos'd the same Thing may be every where at the same time. Or else it must be said, that each God separates himself in such a manner from himself, that he is at the same time himself and another, not that he is separated but in such a manner, that he is at the same time the same, and another that is quite different. This then being abhorrent to Nature, we must say one or the other of these two Things, either that there is an Infinity of *Vulcans*, if we will have this God to reside in all the Statues which represent him, or that he

Conr. Gent.
l. 6. cum El-
men horst. ne-
tis Edit. Han-
burb. 1610.
p. 121.

he is not in one of them, seeing his Nature will not suffer him to be divided. If *Arnobius* here argue well against the Gentiles, he ju-^{vid. Six Con-}stifies this Argument of mine against Transubstantiation; for in-^{ferences.}stead of *Vulcan*, say the Body of *Jesus Christ*, and all his Reasons turn with equal force against it. I may say then the Body of *Christ* Exists according to you in the Eucharist; but does it Exist there in such a manner, that it is entire in each consecrated Host? Or is it therein divided, and in Parts? Certainly neither one and the same Body can be at the same time in several Hosts, neither can it be divided into Parts: Suppose in Effect there be in the World ten Thousand consecrated Hosts, Can (as I've already observ'd) one and the same Body be in these ten Thousand Places at a time? I do not believe it; why not? Because that which of its own Nature is singular cannot be multiply'd in conserving its own Simplicity and Unity: And so much less in this occasion, because the Question is touching a Body like ours. For neither the Hand separated from the Head, nor the Foot divided from the rest of the Body, does make the whole Person. Now if it be said, the Body is quite entire in each of the Hosts, the Truth loses all its force, seeing we suppose the same Thing may be in all Places at the same time; or else you must say, that this Body separates it self in such a manner from it self, that it is, at the same time, the same Body, and another quite different. This then being abhorrent to Nature, you must say one or the other of these two Things. Either that there is an Infinity of *Christ's* Body, if you will have this sacred Body resident in all the consecrated Hosts, or else that it is not one, seeing Nature suffers it not to be divided into several. Thus have I copy'd *Arnobius*, and I desire T. B. to shew me why his Reasoning is not as good against a Papist, as against an Heathen.

§. 18. In the next Place I desire him to consider the Testimony of *St. Augustine*, who uses the same way of Reasoning with particular Application to the Body of *Christ*. The *Manichees* believ'd *Christ* at the same time to be on the Cross, in the Sun, and in the Moon, which they ridiculously call'd his Ships. Against them *St. Augustine* thus argues, Tell me, I pray you (says he) how ^{Aug. contra} many *Christs* you believe there are? He whom the Earth brought forth ^{Faust. l. 262} after he was conceiv'd by the Holy Spirit, and which not only hangs ^{11.} on ev'ry Tree, but is moreover fix'd to ev'ry Herb, does he differ from the other, whom the Jews crucify'd under *Pontius Pilate*, and from this third who is stretch'd out in the Moon, and in the Sun? Or is it the same Saviour fix'd on the Trees by one Part of him, and free in the rest to come to the assistance of that which is fix'd? If it be this last; He that suffer'd according to you under *Pontius Pilate*, how in the first place could he endure this kind of Death, having no
Flesh.

Flesh, as you pretend? And then again, to whom did he leave these Ships to come and undergo those Pains which none but Bodies were capable of? In Effect he could not endure those Things in reference to his Spiritual Presence, and according to the Corporal one he could not be at the same time in the Sun, and in the Moon, and on the Cross. St. Augustine says he could not, let T. B. tell me why he might not be in the Sun and Moon, and on the Cross, in respect of his Body at the same time, as well as in Heaven, and in an infinite number of Places on Earth, as the Popish Creed imports?

§. 19. To this add, The Fathers Argument against the Macedonians. Those Hereticks affirm'd the Holy Ghost to be a Creature of the like Nature with Angels. To refute them the Fathers alledge, That Angels cannot be in several Places at a time. Whereas the Holy Ghost was at the same time in several Places, extream distant from one another, seeing he never forsook the Apostles, altho' in Preaching the Gospel, they were dispers'd over all the Earth. Thus the Great Athanasius argues, or for one him in the Dispute he is said to have against Arius. Thus Diodorus of Alexandria de Spiritu Sancto. (a) St. Basil: (b) Nazianzen, and several others I can name. But were this a good Argument, if it were possible for the same Body to be present in several Places at a time? For if a Body may, much more might a finite Spirit be in distant Places at once. Let T. B. then take heed (as he caution'd me, as to the great St. Hilary) that he make not the Great Athanasius, and others to argue weakly. If Transubstantiation had been then known, why did not the Hereticks answer, that a Spirit might be in many Places at once, as well as a material Body, such as Christ's is: Nor will it serve T. B's. turn to Appeal here to Omnipotence, for these Arguments of the Fathers against both Hereticks and Pagans run upon this, that it is impossible even to Divine Power for a finite Spirit, much more for a bodily Substance to be in many distant Places at once. And now let T. B. call upon Arnobius, the flaming witness St. Augustine, Athanasius, and the rest to gird up their Loins like Men, and check their Presumption for arguing thus. And I hope he will Excuse me for learning to Reason after the Pattern of those great Defenders of our Holy Faith.

§. 20. There is one Thing on this Head in my first Paper, which T. B. takes no Notice of, that the Apostle affirms Christ's Body in all Things like ours except in Sin. Whence I argu'd that like all other Human Bodies it must be in some determinate Space, and not in many Thousand distinct Places at once. And now I come to vindicate my next Argument.

§. 21. (2.) That

§. 21. (2.) *That Transubstantiation contradicts the Reason of Mankind in respect of the Nature of a substantial Change.* Here T. B. Mis-represents me, as if I argu'd that there could not be such a Thing as a substantial Change wrought by Omnipotence, and gravely alledges St. Cyril and St. Ambrose to prove what no Body denies. What I undertook on this Head was to prove that Transubstantiation contradicts our Reason, as to the Nature of a substantial Change: But instead of an Implicance (says T. B.) I produce only an Instance. Yes, Sir, I shew that in a substantial Change, one Substance is annihilated, and another Substance, that was not in Being before, is produc'd, and put into the room of it. And I desire T. B. to Examin all the substantial Changes mention'd by St. Cyril or St. Ambrose, and tell me whether these Laws be not observ'd in them, as well as in the Instance alledg'd by me, of the substantial Change of Water into Wine. Hence I infer, that to talk of a Transubstantiation, where no such substantial Change is made, is to make no Transubstantiation to be a Transubstantiation. For the receding of one Substance, and another, that had a Being before coming into its room, is no Transubstantiation, unless as oft as one Body leaves a Place, and another succeeds into the same Place, you will affirm a Transubstantiation is made.

§. 22. We presume not (as T. B. somewhat irreverently Expresses the Matter) *to drive Omnipotence like a Pack-Horse always in the same Road*: But since our Reason is from God, we dare conclude that he will not make that a Transubstantiation, which according to the Reason he hath given us is no Transubstantiation, nor oblige us to believe a substantial Change made where no new Substance is produc'd. And here to have prevented your recurring to Omnipotence to shelter your Absurdities, I took occasion to remind you, that you had no Encouragement from Divine Revelation, which after Consecration calls the Elements Bread five times, and the Cup the Fruit of the Vine. For it is hence manifest that from the Letter of the Text there is five to one more against Transubstantiation than for it. And what use can T. B. make of his Instances in two or three figurative Phrases, unless he will allow of Figures in Sacramentals?

§. 23. But, says T. B. *God is no more bound to dress every Creature alway in its proper Accidents, than to create Adam and Eve in their Cloaths.* It seems then to T. B. that Accidents are of no more use for the distinction of Things than Cloaths. For if the Accidents of Things are necessary for us to distinguish them by, does not he make God the Author of Confusion, who supposes

he will cloath one Thing with the Accidents of another? Since if he do so at his Pleasure, a Man can be sure of nothing. What he takes for a Man may be a Dog, fitter to be kick'd than caress'd. What he takes for Bread may be Arsnick, fitter to Poison than Nourish him. And what we tell the Infidel is a Miracle, he may tell us is none at all. We tell him that Christ rais'd *Lazarus* from the Dead, and he may (taught by T. B.) tell us, that it is only a Dead Man cloath'd in the Accidents of a Living Man, or it was not Dead *Lazarus*, but a Living Dog cloath'd under the Accidents of *Lazarus*. And we then have more honourable Sentiments of the Divine Majesty than T. B. and his Party, in that we suppose that God will never do that, which would take away all Certainty, and betray Men unavoidably to eternal Scepticism.

S. 24. But why then (urges T. B.) had not Christ's sacred Humanity its own Figure and Lineaments, when he appear'd to St. Mary Magdalen, and the two Disciples going to Emaus? I say, it had. How came Mary then to take him for the Gardiner? The Reason is plain, because it was Dark or Duskish at least, in which Case it is no wonder, for a while to mistake, especially on a sudden Surprize or great Fear, which might Amaze her for a while. For when she had recollected her self she knew him (which she could not have done, had he been under the Accidents of another Person) and went immediately and told the Disciples, *That she had seen the Lord*. The same may be said of the two Disciples at Emaus. They were possess'd with a firm Perswasion of their Master's Death, and not exactly viewing the Stranger (as they suppos'd) that walk'd with them, till he came to bless Bread, they knew him not before: But then as soon as they earnestly observ'd him, they knew him by his Lineaments. As therefore it is absurd to suppose, that God should Cloath one Being with the Accidents of another, as he is suppos'd to do in Transubstantiation, I further request T. B. to resolve me whether it be not absurd to say that *any Thing should produce it self*? Yet if it be *Jesus Christ* himself, and that too as Man, whose Work Transubstantiation is, as you teach, and that the Consecration is a Priestly Act of our Saviour, who immolates himself by the Ministry of the Priest reducing himself into a State of Death under the Species of Bread and Wine, you suppose that he, as Man changes the Bread into his Body. And if so, his Human Nature is produc'd by Christ as Man, and *Jesus Christ* Man creates himself, produces himself, and consequently there is a Relation between *Jesus Christ* Man, and *Jesus Christ* Man, between *Jesus Christ* Sacrificer, and *Jesus Christ* sacrific'd, between *Jesus Christ*

Christ producing, and Jesus Christ produced, and yet as nothing is produc'd by it self, so nothing hath Relation to its self. Which are Absurdities my Reason cannot Reconcile.

§. 25. (3.) That Transubstantiation contradicts the Reason of Mankind about the Nature and Use of a Miracle, which is my next Argument, excepted against by T. B. and first from the T. B. §. 6. Authority of St. Chrysostome, which Testimony I reserv'd to Examin in this Place. O Miracle! says he, O wonderful Goodness! *De Sacerdotio* 1. 3. He who sits above with the Father, at the same Instant is manag'd by the Hands of all, and delivers himself to such as desire to receive and embrace him. Let us enquire what St. Chrysostome means by *ὁ τὸ δαύματος*! O Miracle! And its obvious to observe that this Exclamation is us'd where there is no proper Miracle. So when St. Basil says of Baptism, O Miracle! thou art made new without being melted down: Thou art heal'd not being wounded, and dost thou not admire the Grace! And when St. (a) Chrysostome himself, O (a) Ecloga de Miracle, how do all gape after present Things, and mind not Things to come; and (b) O Miracle, whither hath he exalted his Church! (b) Hom. 3. drawing it as it were by some Machine, he hath advanc'd it to a in Eph. great height, and made her to sit in that Seat, where the Head is. And (c) speaking of one Baptiz'd, he says, Because the Earth is (c) Hom. 6. under thee, think not therefore that thou art on the Earth. There in Coloss. (i. e. at Baptism) thou art translated into Heaven. There these Things are done among the Angels. God hath wrapt thy Soul into Heaven, translated thee above, and set thee by the Regal Throne. Are all these proper Miracles? Is the Church, the Baptiz'd Person, corporally in Heaven, and on the Earth at the same time? Or is it Reason to take these Rhetorical Harangues in a literal strictness? Then every Baptiz'd Person, every Member of the Church, nay, every Worldly Man is a proper Miracle. We allow a Wonder in the Efficacy, not in the Elements of the Sacraments. And that as the Church may be in Heaven and in Earth too, in Christ her Head mystically, and representatively, so is Christ in Heaven at the right Hand of the Father, and at the same time, in the Hands of the Faithful in the Eucharist, who touch and embrace him not in himself corporally, but in the Symbols representing, and sacramentally exhibiting him, and spiritually uniting us to him. Let us hear St. Chrysostome a little above the Words in debate thus speaking, When thou seest the Lord sacrific'd, and lying along, the Priest standing and praying over the Sacrifice, and all purpled with that precious Blood, dost thou think thou art yet among Men, or that thou standest on the Earth? Will T. B. take this in a literal Sense? Will he say Christ is in the Eucharist as Slain, as Dead, and as his Blood is pour'd out of

*Pererius in Jo.
c. 6. Disput.
16. Numb. 48.
(a) Part second,
Numb. 25.*

*Aug. 1.3. c. 19.
de Trinit.*

*Athen. in illud
Evangel. Quicum-
que dixerit Ver-
bum, &c. Et
in c. 6. Jo. qui
manducat car-
nem meam.
&c.*

T. B. §. 8.

his Veins, and purples the Communicants? If Christ be under those respects in the Eucharist only representatively, or in the Sign, this *Hyperbole* proves not that St. *Chrysostome* believ'd Transubstantiation. Now what is it that I charge with Impudence? Nothing that St. *Chrysostome* can be charg'd with, who no where teaches a substantial, but only a sacramental Change in the Eucharist; never dream'd of a Miracle in the Elements, but only in the Efficacy of the Sacrament, and no more than in Baptism. While Popish Writers pretend nine swinging Miracles in the Change of the Elements, and the (a) *Catech. ad Parochos*, reckons three Miracles from which they magnify their Priesthood, and boast of as a standing Glory in their Communion, to have such mighty Miracles in their Priest's Command. And this I think to have an Air of Impudence to boast of Miracles, and a bodily Change, which to no Man's Senses are, or can be perceptible. Especially if it be consider'd what St. *Augustine* saith (speaking of the Bread in the Eucharist) *Because these Things are known to Men, as being made by Men, they may have Honour given them for their relation to Religion, but cannot raise Astonishment as Miracles.*

§. 26. I shall conclude this Point with this Passage out of the great *Athanasius*. The Lord, (says he) distinguishes Flesh from Spirit, to teach us that what he says are not Carnal, but Spiritual. For how many Men must his Body suffice for Food, that it might be the Nourishment of the whole World? But for this Reason did he mention his Ascension into Heaven, that he might draw them from a corporal Meaning, and they might understand that his Flesh of which he had spoken, was Heavenly (ἡ πνευματικὴ τροφή) and Spiritual Food, to be given by him from above. For the Things which I have said to you, they are Spirit and Life, which is as if he had said, My Body which is shew'd to, and given for the World, was given for Meat, that it may be bestow'd on every one (πνευματικῶς) Spiritually, and may become in every one a Preservation to a Resurrection to Eternal Life. I hope this Author never imagin'd the Body of Christ to be in the Eucharist unless Spiritually, since he thought his Bodily Ascension into Heaven inconsistent with a carnal Manducation.

§. 27. (5.) My next Argument against Transubstantiation was, from the Inhumanity suppos'd in eating the Flesh, and drinking the Blood of a Man. This T. B. makes nothing at all of. Farewel all Divine Faith, says he, if this were to be fear'd. What? Must we then allow the Christian Faith to be Barbarous and Inhuman? Are not all Christians oblig'd to vindicate it from such Imputations? And will not Christ hereafter call those to a sad Reckoning, that to the Faith he reveal'd, add such Figments of their

OWD,

own, as render it contemptible to Jews, Turks and Pagans? I desire T. B. to let us know, what he thinks of St. Augustine's *Aug. de doct. Rule*, for the right understanding of the Scripture. *Is*, says *Christ. l. 3.* he, the Speech be a Precept forbidding some hainous Crime, or commanding us to do good, it is not Figurative: But if it seem to command any hainous Wickedness, or Crime, or to forbid that which is profitable or beneficial to others, it is Figurative. For Example: Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you. This seems to command an hainous Wickedness and Crime, therefore it is a Figure: Commanding us to communicate of the Passion of our Lord, and with Delight and Advantage to lay up in our Memory, that his Flesh was crucify'd and wounded for us. Is it possible that any Man in his Wits, that believ'd Transubstantiation, would have express'd himself thus? Would not that Command (except ye eat the Flesh, &c.) be literal, if it requir'd the eating of Christ's natural Body and drinking his natural Blood, tho' not in its own Shape? And does not St. Augustine say, it is a figurative Speech, wherein we are commanded spiritually to feed on the Remembrance of Christ's Passion? St. Augustine then thought it a piece of Barbarity to eat properly Christ's natural Body in any Shape, tho' T. B. do not. No Wonder then, that the Editor of Fulbertus, Bishop of Chartres, *Biblioth. Patrum tom. 11. Edit. Colon. p. 44.* A. 1608. adds to this Passage of St. Augustine, cited by Fulbertus without naming him, and so not known by the Editor to be St. Augustine: *Figura ergo est dicit Hæreticus. It is a Figure then, will an Heretick say.* For if we be Hereticks in this, he had good reason to think St. Augustine no better.

§. 28. But the two famous Friends, that pray'd they might be united into one, were never (says T. B.) accounted horrible. But what if they had pray'd, that the Body of the one might be ground and bruise'd by the Teeth of the other? As poor Berengarius was forc'd to word Transubstantiation in his Recantation. What would Antiquity have thought of that? Even as Horrible, Inhumane and Barbarous, as Averroes thought of Transubstantiation. In Paschasius is a ridiculous Story (tho' some think it, with the rest like it, foisted into his Book) of one Plegiles, or Plegilius, a Priest, How an Angel shew'd him Christ in the form of a Child on the Altar, whom first he took into his Arms and kiss'd; and then (when return'd to his former Shape again) eat him up. On which Berengarius is said to jest thus. *Speciosa quidem Pax, &c. A proper Pax indeed, for the Knave to devour with his Teeth, whom he had kiss'd with his Mouth.* And I think he had reason for this Censure of Plegil's Inhumanity. But since T. B. endeavours to support Transubstantiation with Poetical

*Pererius in Jo.
c. 6. Disput.
16. Numb. 48.*

*(a) Part second,
Numb. 25.*

*Aug. 1. 3. c. 10.
de Trin.*

*Athan. in illud
Evangel. Quicum-
que dixerit Ver-
bum, &c. Et
in c. 6. Jo. qui
manducat car-
nem meam.
&c.*

his Veins, and purples the Communicants? If Christ be under those respects in the Eucharist only representatively, or in the Sign, this *Hyperbole* proves not that St. *Chrysostome* believ'd Transubstantiation. Now what is it that I charge with Impudence? Nothing that St. *Chrysostome* can be charg'd with, who no where teaches a substantial, but only a sacramental Change in the Eucharist; never dream'd of a Miracle in the Elements, but only in the Efficacy of the Sacrament, and no more than in Baptism. While Popish Writers pretend nine swinging Miracles in the Change of the Elements, and the (a) *Catech. ad Parochos*, reckons three Miracles from which they magnify their Priesthood, and boast of as a standing Glory in their Communion, to have such mighty Miracles in their Priest's Command. And this I think to have an Air of Impudence to boast of Miracles, and a bodily Change, which to no Man's Senses are, or can be perceptible. Especially if it be consider'd what St. *Augustine* saith (speaking of the Bread in the Eucharist) *Because these Things are known to Men, as being made by Men, they may have Honour given them for their relation to Religion, but cannot raise Astonishment as Miracles.*

§. 26. I shall conclude this Point with this Passage out of the great *Athanasius*. The Lord, (says he) distinguishes Flesh from Spirit, to teach us that what he says are not Carnal, but Spiritual. For how many Men must his Body suffice for Food, that it might be the Nourishment of the whole World? But for this Reason did he mention his Ascension into Heaven, that he might draw them from a corporal Meaning, and they might understand that his Flesh of which he had spoken, was Heavenly (*ἡ πνευματικὴ τροφή*) and Spiritual Food, to be given by him from above. For the Things which I have said to you, they are Spirit and Life, which is as if he had said, My Body which is shew'd to, and given for the World, was given for Meat, that it may be bestow'd on every one (*πνευματικῶς*) Spiritually, and may become in every one a Preservation to a Resurrection to Eternal Life. I hope this Author never imagin'd the Body of Christ to be in the Eucharist unless Spiritually, since he thought his Bodily Ascension into Heaven inconsistent with a carnal Manducation.

T. B. §. 8.

§. 27. (5.) My next Argument against Transubstantiation was, from the Inhumanity suppos'd in eating the Flesh, and drinking the Blood of a Man. This T. B. makes nothing at all of. Farewel all Divine Faith, says he, if this were to be fear'd. What? Must we then allow the Christian Faith to be Barbarous and Inhuman? Are not all Christians oblig'd to vindicate it from such Imputations? And will not Christ hereafter call those to a sad Reckoning, that to the Faith he reveal'd, add such Figments of their

OWD,

own, as render it contemptible to *Jews, Turks and Pagans*? I desire *T. B.* to let us know, what he thinks of *St. Augustine's* *Aug. de doct. Rule*, for the right understanding of the Scripture. *Is*, says *Christ. l. 3.* he, *the Speech be a Precept forbidding some hainous Crime, or com-* *tom. 3 p. 53.* *manding us to do good, it is not Figurative: But if it seem to command any hainous Wickedness, or Crime, or to forbid that which is profitable or beneficial to others, it is Figurative. For Example: Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you. This seems to command an hainous Wickedness and Crime, therefore it is a Figure: Commanding us to communicate of the Passion of our Lord, and with Delight and Advantage to lay up in our Memory, that his Flesh was cruci'y'd and wounded for us. Is it possible that any Man in his Wits, that believ'd Transubstantiation, would have express'd himself thus? Would not that Command (except ye eat the Flesh, &c.) be literal, if it requir'd the eating of Christ's natural Body and drinking his natural Blood, tho' not in its own Shape? And does not St. Augustine say, it is a figurative Speech, wherein we are commanded spiritually to feed on the Remembrance of Christ's Passion? St. Augustine then thought it a piece of Barbarity to eat properly Christ's natural Body in any Shape, tho' T. B. do not. No Wonder then, that the Editor of *Fulbertus, Bishop of Chartres*, *Biblioth. Patrum tom. 11. Edit. Colon. p. 44.* *A. 1608.* adds to this Passage of *St. Augustine*, cited by *Fulbertus* without naming him, and so not known by the Editor to be *St. Augustine: Figura ergo est dicet Hæreticus. It is a Figure then, will an Heretick say. For if we be Hereticks in this, he had good reason to think St. Augustine no better.**

§. 28. But the two famous Friends, that pray'd they might be united into one, were never (says *T. B.*) accounted horrible. But what if they had pray'd, that the Body of the one might be ground and bruise'd by the Teeth of the other? As poor *Berengarius* was forc'd to word Transubstantiation in his Recantation. What would Antiquity have thought of that? Even as Horrible, Inhumane and Barbarous, as *Averroes* thought of Transubstantiation. In *Paschasius* is a ridiculous Story (tho' some think it, with the rest like it, foisted into his Book) of one *Plegiles*, or *Plegilius*, a Priest, How an Angel shew'd him Christ in the form of a Child on the Altar, whom first he took into his Arms and kiss'd; and then (when return'd to his former Shape again) eat him up. On which *Berengarius* is said to jest thus. *Speciosa quidem Pax, &c. A proper Pax indeed, for the Knave to devour with his Teeth, whom he had kiss'd with his Mouth. And I think he had reason for this Censure of Plegil's Inhumanity. But since T. B. endeavours to support Transubstantiation with Po-* *etical*

etical Fables, *Ovid's Metamorphosis* would be the best Book in the World for his Purpose; I hope he will not take it ill, if I attempt his Confutation out of that Author, by applying the Story of *Actæon* thus. Suppose not his Dogs, but his Servants had known their Master lay under the Accidents of a *Stag*, and yet at the Command of *Diana* had devour'd him; What would you think of the Deity, that should give so cruel a Command, or of the Men that executed it? Would not that have been barbarous Inhumanity in the Servants, that knew what lay under that false Appearance, which was only Nature in the Dogs? What Horror does the Poet express at *Thyestes's* Banquet, tho' *Atreus* was ignorant, it was the Flesh of his Children he was eating? And can the Transubstantiator believe he is eating the substantial Flesh of his Saviour without Horror? The old *Pythagoreans* shew'd more Humanity in abstaining from the Flesh of Beasts, lest the Soul of some Friend had been translated into it, according to their Notion of a *Metempsychosis*. But *St. Chrysostome* is here brought in to very little Purpose. The Passage is altogether *Hyperbolical* Expressions us'd that a *Papist* cannot think true without great Allowances, and we said to be as really converted into Christ's Flesh as the Bread. And sure *T. B.* is too wise to offer this for a Proof of Transubstantiation in the Eucharist. And now *T. B.* congratulates himself for having pass'd all the sharp-edg'd Weapons of Contradiction, and the dull Tools of Repugnancy unhurt. No Wonder; for he hath taken a sure way to save himself, by keeping at an honourable Distance, and never venturing near an Argument, but standing aloof and shooting his randome Shots to no Purpose. For I dare appeal to any Man of Sense, whether he hath fairly, and like a Scholar, examin'd one Argument, and not rather rais'd a little Dust to convey himself away in the Cloud. And I hope the Gentleman, for whose sake I write, will take notice of *T. B's*. Triflings, and consider my *Reasons* more maturely than He hath done.

§. 29. Before I conclude this Head of Scandal and Repugnancy, which *T. B.* counts so dull a Tool, I have two Things to remind him of. One is the scandalous Picture over an Altar at *Wormes*, related by so many Travellers, that I cannot doubt the Truth of it. It represents a Mill, the Virgin Mary throwing Christ into the Hopper, and he comes out at the Eye of the Mill all in Wafers, which some Priests take up to give the People. Could any thing represent Transubstantiation more truly, or more ridiculous? And what could more expose Christianity to the scorn of *Infidels*, than such a Picture in a *Christian Church*, and

and the most sacred Part of it too, over the *Altar*? The other thing I desire may be took notice of, is, the Account given lately by *George Psalmanazar*, a Native of *Formosa*, in his Description of that Island, c. 35. Of the Conversion by *Xaverius* made in *Japan*, and the Destruction of Christianity there afterward. Wherein he acquaints us, that, *At first he and his Accomplices said nothing of Transubstantiation; and that after they began to urge that as a necessary Doctrine, it gave such Scandal to the new Converts and to the Heathens there, as to be one great Occasion of the following Revolution, and Slaughter of Christians, and Extirpation of Christianity out of Japan.* So little reason hath *T. B.* to boast of *Xaverius's* Conversion as a Proof of Transubstantiation, since the suppressing of that monstrous Doctrine help'd forward that Conversion, and the discovery of it at length, unravell'd all their Labours.

§. 30. (6.) My last Argument from Antiquity, *T. B.* treats *T. B. § 9.* with a deal of Scorn, but makes me good amends by his very weak reasoning against it.

He first exclaims at my *Immodesty in attempting to prove a Negative.* But some *Negatives* are so plain, that the *Immodesty* is more in those that demand, than in one that undertakes a Proof of them. If any should be so impudent as to affirm, the ancient *Philosophers* thought two and three to be six, there would be no Impudence in attempting to prove the *Negative* against him, tho very much both Impudence and Impertinence in them, that puts on us such needless Undertakings.

§. 31. But this is made another Aggravation of my Impudence, that *I undertake to prove a Negative for above 1600 Years before I was born.* Why Sir, am not I as able to consult the Records and Monuments of former Times, as if I had been much elder? Am I the only Man that has presum'd to speak of Times and Ages long before he was born? Does not *Dr. Forbes*, as well as others of our learn'd Writers on this Subject, and some *Papists* too, prove Antiquity a Stranger to Transubstantiation? Why then all this Clamour at me?

§. 32. But did not the Council of Lateran, &c. decree Transubstantiation, and were not these ancient in comparison of one that *T. B. §. 10.* is not much above fifty? Is not this very silly and trifling Stuff? Sure the Council of *Lateran* is late enough to prove Transubstantiation a Novelty, which was a Doctrine in the Church no sooner. Can *T. B.* be so absurd as to imagine, that by Antiquity I meant all Ages before my Birth? Or intended to prove, that Transubstantiation was not five hundred Years old? It's plain enough I design'd to prove, that the Primitive Fathers
for

for the first five or six Centuries taught no such Doctrine, nor as T. B. trifles that it was no older than I am.

§. 33. I wonder T. B. hath the Confidence to affirm here, that the *Centuriators*, *Oecolampadius*, *Peter Martyr* and other Protestants acknowledge, that *St. Cyril of Jerusalem*, *St. Chrysostome* and *St. Cyprian* held Transubstantiation, which is a notorious Untruth, and hath been long since prov'd to be such, by our learn'd Bishop *Morton*, in his *Catholick Appeal*, l. 2. c. 2.

§. 34. And now T. B. pretends to be recover'd from his Astonishment, which hath made him for a whole Page so impertinent, and begins to examine my Arguments.

(1.) The first was from the silence of *Heathens*, who in the first Ages never upbraid Christians with Transubstantiation.

T. B. §. 11. This T. B. imputes to the Care of the Fathers, to conceal this Doctrine from the Heathens. Tho' it was no necessary Doctrine about the Sacraments, but the Names of the Elements, both in Baptism and the Eucharist, that they so studiously conceal'd. And I desire T. B. to reconcile this to the Pretences he makes of clear Testimonies out of the Fathers for Transubstantiation. For it is absurd to offer us their clear Testimonies for what they studiously conceal'd.

§. 35. But T. B. tells us many of *Julian's* Objections are lost, among which there might have been some Scoffs at Transubstantiation. However Sir, are *Tryphon*, the Jew's Argument against Christianity, or *Celsus* the Heathen's lost, which are particularly answer'd, that by *Justin Martyr*, and this by *Origen*? And if the Fathers were so free and full in declaring this Doctrine (as T. B. supposes in his Testimonies, when he says, *What Expressions! What Proofs! What could a Roman Catholick say more?* How could it be possibly conceal'd from inquisitive Adversaries? A sure Argument those full Expressions are (as I have shew'd) nothing to the purpose of Transubstantiation. But T. B. in a good Humour now pities my Misfortune in pitching on the Instance out of *Oecumenius*, which shews how early Heathens did not only object, but torture People for this Belief. And I want not an Opportunity here in my turn to pity T. B. who so grossly, and I fear wilfully mistakes the Story; and if he had read the Greek in the Margin, could not sure have blunder'd, as he does, about my *Parentesis*, which relates to the Masters, which were only *Catechumens*, and not to the Servants, that were Heathens, and ignorant of their Masters Principles, and had only heard them talk of the Eucharist as Christ's Body and Blood. This Hint the Heathens catch'd at, and I purposely mention'd

mention'd it, to shew how ready they were to take Offence at the Terms of Christ's Flesh and Blood, and that they would have been much more furious at such a scandalous Interpretation of it, as the Church of *Rome* makes, and these Primitive Confessors disown.

But says *T. B.* they do not deny, but wisely evade an odious Question. I find he hath here help'd the *Jesuits* to a very anti-Precedent for Equivocation; but whether it be without reflecting on these Confessors Ingenuity, let the World judge. Is this Sir, according to one Apostle's Command, to give a Reason of your Faith, when demanded? Was this after the Example of another, not to be asham'd of the Gospel of Christ? If they could be justify'd in studiously concealing the Mysteries, did they do well to disown a necessary Article of their Faith (as you pretend) when charg'd with it? I desire *T. B.* to read the Greek Text of *Oecumenius* again, and then tell me, whether *Blandina* could be said to answer (*εὐσέχως*) directly, if she had return'd an equivocal and indirect Answer, as *T. B.* very disingenuously supposes, and against his own third Rule, for explaining Scripture and Fathers?

And why is my Choice of this Passage so unfortunate, which proves, that in this one only Instance in Antiquity, of Heathens suspecting Christians of believing any thing like Transubstantiation, the Pious and Courageous *Blandina* denies it?

§. 36. (2.) My next Argument to prove the Fathers were Strangers to Transubstantiation, was, That they us'd such Arguments against Heathens, as would have been as cogent against themselves, if they had held Transubstantiation. What is *T. B.*'s Answer? Why Heathens might retort the Fathers Arguments against worshipping Dead Men. Answer. Not sure with equal Force and Cogency. *Arians*, that worship'd one whom they believ'd to be a meer Man, were liable to the same Arguments as were us'd against Heathen Idolatry, but not the Orthodox, who believ'd the Object of their Adoration to be God as well as Man. T. B. §. 12.

§. 37. But says *T. B.* there was less danger of having their Arguments retorted, because the Doctrin of Transubstantiation was carefully conceal'd from the Heathens. But what a Character of the Fathers Ingenuity is this, to urge the Heathens with such Arguments as they know to be as cogent against themselves, tho' the Heathens did not? Which Heathens could not retort; not that the Christians Doctrin was less absurd, but that they were more craftily conceal'd. A rare way of

H h

vindi-

vindicating Transubstantiation, by exposing the Fathers and Christianity too.

§. 38. 1. If it was absurd for an Heathen to pretend to make his God, let T. B. tell me, why it is not as absurd for a Popish Priest to pretend to be a Creator of his Creator. To which he says not one Word, tho' I desire to know whether he will pretend to justify it, as I know one does that is directed by him, which makes me suspect he teaches the same. Let him tell us, what he thinks of *Pelbartus de Themewar, Fol. 97. A. 1414.* who calls the Priest Vicar of God, and Father of Christ, whom by Consecration in the Sacrament he hath begotten. Nay, what thinks he of *Cornel. a Lapide*, in his Roman Lectures, saying, That by the Words of Consecration truly and really, as the Bread is transubstantiated, so Christ is produc'd, and as it were generated upon the Altar, in such a powerful and effectual manner, that if Christ had not yet been incarnate, by these Words *hoc enim est corpus meum*, he should be incarnated and assume an Humane Body. Do not these Expressions deserve as much to be derided, as Heathens for pretending to make their Gods?

§. 39. 2. If it was absurd for Heathens to adore them as Gods, that might be stoln by Men or Vermine, I desire T. B. to tell me, whether it had not been equally absurd for Christians to adore such an Object, as must be kept under Lock and Key to prevent the like Disasters? Does not our Blessed Saviour fore-warn us against this? *If any Man say, Lo here is Christ, or there, believe it not.——Behold he is in tiquis, in cellis penuariis*) in Cupboards, such as they keep Meat in, believe it not. Is not this a very proper Word for those little Cabinets on Popish Altars, wherein they lock up the consecrated Elements, lest Vermine should run away with, and prey on what they adore.

§. 40. 3. If it was absurd in Heathens to worship what they eat, why not in Christians? What thinks T. B. of *Theodoret*: who says, that God foreseeing that Men would fall to such extremity of Madnes as to worship Beasts, the better to restrain that Wickedness, suffer'd us to eat them. And elsewhere, that Beasts were divided into clean and unclean by God, that Men abhorring what they judg'd unclean, and eating what they call'd clean, might worship neither. For can any Man of Sense conceive that to be a God which he abominates as unclean, or which he offers to the true God, and himself doth eat? Did he imagine a Christian eats his God in the Eucharist, as the Romanists pretend to do, to the Scandal of all the World, and the Justification of the most absurd Idolatry of Heathens, in adoring what they eat?

Theod. Quest. 55. in Gen.

Et quest. 11. in Levit.

eat? I expect a distinct Answer to these Particulars, such as may not reflect on the Ingenuity of the Fathers, which yet is not done.

To conclude this Point, I challenge *T. B.* to shew us any thing more sottish, more savage and cruel in *Paganism*, than I have, and will shew in Transubstantiation. Did they feed on dead Men, devour their Enemies, or entomb the Corps of their deceas'd Friends in their Bowels, or sacrifice Men to their Idols? And are not all these ty'd together in this Fiction of Transubstantiation? Was ever *Indians* so impos'd on by their Priests, as to believe they had Power by a form of Words to turn a Cake of Maize into a living Man, and that the Miracle is done, tho' the Cake appear to all their Senses unalter'd? How can it appear absurd, for *Indian* Canabals to eat their Enemies or Friends, to any of you that profess to eat the Flesh, not only of a living Man, but of your dearest Friend and Saviour? But then to maintain this absurd Fiction, by murdering many thousand Innocents that could not comply with the Imposture. What is this short of the *Indians* Barbarity, in Sacrificing their Captives to their Idol *Vitzilputzly*? If Heathen Priests should thus impose on those poor Salvages, how might a Christian Apologist thus bemoan or deride them? O ye poor *Paynims*, destitute of all Sense and Reason, that are thus shamefully impos'd on by your deceitful Priests! Or, O miserable People, that must believe what it is impossible for any one in his Wits to believe! Or else, must be murder'd by the Grim Officers incens'd against you, by the Complaints of a fraudulent and bloody Priesthood! What then shall be said, when this is done in civiliz'd Parts of the World! Sure, had the Holy Fathers been conscious to themselves of such a thing, they durst not have so freely inveigh'd against *Pagan* Absurdities, which they knew to be out-done in Christendome.

Dr. H. Moore
Dial.

§. 41. As to what *T. B.* says in the close of this Paragraph, of the Fathers adoring the Eucharist, we grant they adore Christ at the Eucharist, and so do we; but they no more ador'd the Elements than we do.

§. 42. (3.) *The Fathers Arguments against Hereticks*, which shew they were Strangers to Transubstantiation, come now to be review'd, and *T. B.*'s trifling way of evading them expos'd.

1. The first is *St. Augustine's* Answer to an Argument of the *Manichees*. *Adamantus*, to prove the Author of the *Old* and *New Testament* were not the same, urges this, That the *Old Testament* says the Blood is the Soul. The *New* teaches the contrary, that the Soul cannot be kill'd, and therefore is not the Blood that may

be destroy'd. *St. Augustine*, to manifest there is no Contrariety undertakes to prove, That when the Law says the Blood is the Soul, it does not mean that they are substantially the same (for then by destroying the Blood, the Soul would be destroy'd) but that the Blood is a Sign of the Soul, as when Christ saith this is my Body, he means the Sign of my Body, and consequently that Passage in the Old Testament, proves not that the Soul may be kill'd, nor contradicts the New, which says it cannot.. Now suppose a *Manichee* should answer as T. B. doth, That as the Bread both signifies and contains Christ's Body, and this is my Body denotes so much, so the Blood is the Soul, means that the Blood both signifies and contains the Soul: And tho' the Thing signify'd be not destroy'd, by the Destruction of the Sign, yet the Thing contain'd may be destroy'd by the Destruction of the Thing containing. Suppose I say a *Manichee* had answer'd thus, how would *St. Augustine's* Argument from the Eucharist have press'd him at all? Suppose *St. Augustine* had granted that the Blood was as truly the Soul, as a *Romanist* will say the Bread is Christ's Body, would he not have yielded up to the *Manichee* this Sense of the Phrase? If he had yielded that the Sign was substantially the same with the Thing signify'd by it, his Illustration from the Eucharist, had been Impertinent, made for his Adversary, and prov'd Blood and the Soul to be substantially the same. And when T. B. hath consider'd this again, he will not see Reason for his Exultation, that this Testimony makes for Transubstantiation, which he hath no other way to bring about, but by making *St. Augustine* an impertinent Arguer, and I hope on second Thoughts he will have more respect for the Flaming witted *St. Augustine*. The Inquisitors at *Madrid* were more sensible than T. B. of the Cogency of this Testimony, and wisely order'd in their *Index Expurgatorius Sandoval*. in *St. Augustine*, those Words to be ras'd, Christ hath given the Sign of his Body. It should seem, that they could perceive this Argument made against them, and not as T. B's. perverse Understanding represents it, very much for them, since they take so much Care to Erase it.

§. 43. 2. The Father's Arguments against the *Marcionites*, &c. I shew'd were a clear Proof that they did not believe Transubstantiation. As first *Tertullian's* Argument from our Senses. To this T. B. says, That this being brought only to prove, that we ought to believe our Senses, is already answer'd. Sure, Sir, you grossly Mistake. Was this brought only to prove that we ought to believe our Senses? Was it not brought to prove that *Tertullian* thought Evidence from Sense, was a good Argument against a *Marcionite*, and therefore could not be for Transubstantiation without.

without confuting himself? Suppose *Tertullian* had been of *T. B.*'s Mind, as to Transubstantiation, and had thus argu'd against the *Marcionites*, might not a *Marcionite* have answer'd, you do not believe your Senses in the Eucharist, and why may they not deceive us in the Incarnation too? If the Authority of the Text, *This is my Body*, may over-rule Sense, these Words also, *Christ is God*, may do so too; and for all the Testimony of Sense, I may believe Christ had no real Body, but only the Accidents of a Body, without the Substance, as that the Accidents of Bread are in the Eucharist without their Substance. May not ev'ry Word of *Tertullian*, be apply'd as well against a *Papist* as a *Marcionite*? O thou *Malapert* (*Academick*) Transubstantiator, what dost thou do in charging the Senses with Deceit? Thou overturnest the whole State of Life, thou disturbest all the Order of Nature, thou blindest the Providence of God himself, who (according to thee) has set lying and deceitful Senses as Lords over all his Works, for to understand, inhabit, dispense, and enjoy them.—It's no way fit to call those Senses in question, lest we should doubt of their Credit, even in Christ himself, lest it should be said, that he falsly saw Satan thrown down from Heaven, or falsly heard his Father's Voice testifying concerning him, or was deceiv'd when he touch'd Peter's Wives Mother, or perceiv'd afterward a different Scent of the Ointment, which he accepted for his Burial, and afterward a different Taste in the Wine, which he consecrated in Memory of his Blood. Whatever way the *Papist* seeks to evade these Arguments, the *Marcionite* might escape the same way; and I challenge *T. B.* to bring his Transubstantiator off without enervating all *Tertullian*'s Reasonings against those Hereticks. For if he fly to a superiour Authority, and the Obsequiousness of Faith, the *Marcionite* will make the same Pretence, and with as much Truth too. Let the last Clause in *Tertullian* be also observ'd, that justifies the trusting of Taste even in the Matter of the Sacrament, for if that be true, the Doctrin of Transubstantiation is certainly false.

§. 44. Here I desire *T. B.* to consider *Epiphanius*, who largely argues the Truth of Christ's Body, from what was sensibly done to his Body. And if he argues truly, then what was sensibly done to the Bread in the Eucharist, proves the Truth of Bread remaining, and not only the appearance of it. He asks *Marcion* how could he be taken and crucify'd, if according to thy saying he could not be handled?—For thou canst not define him to be a Phantom whom thou confessest to fall under the Touch. I ask a *Papist*, how can Bread be broken, if there be no Substance to be handled? For thou canst not define that to be a mere appearance, which thou confessest to fall under the Touch. And its plain if *Epiphanius*

*Tert. Contra
Marc. l. 4.
c. 40.*

nus argu'd well against the former, I argue as strongly against the latter, and its absurd to suppose he believ'd Transubstantiation, whose Arguments confute it as plainly as the Heresy of Marcion.

§. 45. Secondly, I urg'd Tertullian, where he argues, *That Christ must have a true Body, because the Eucharist is a Figure of his Body, and a Phantom cannot have a Figure.* This T. B. passes by very wisely in a deep Silence. For suppose T. B. had answer'd for the Marcionite, the Bread in the Eucharist is a mere Phantom, only Accidents without the Substance. What had become of Tertullian's Argument? Might not they have said as the Eutychians in Theodoret did afterwards, as the Accidents of Bread in the Eucharist are without the Substance, so the Accidents of an Human Body in Christ might be without a real substantial Human Body, and tho' the Representation of Christ's Body and Blood by substantial Bread and Wine might have inferr'd the reality of his Flesh, yet the Representation of him by mere Phantastical Accidents can infer no such Thing. And it was much better for T. B. to say nothing to this, than help the Hereticks at a dead lift, as he must have done if he had spoke like a Transubstantiator.

§. 46. Clemens Alexandrinus's Argument against the Encratite, comes next to be vindicated. The force of his Argument consists in this, That it is Lawful to drink Wine, because Christ gave his Disciples Wine to drink in the Eucharist. To this T. B. says it was not real Wine, but only the Accidents of Wine call'd Wine, as the Rod turn'd into a Serpent, is call'd a Rod still. Well then, says the Encratite, I thank T. B. for this, for it was not I see Wine, but Blood the Disciples drank, tho' it were call'd Wine. Clemens Alexandrinus would have impos'd on me, and perswaded me it was the Fruit of the Vine, which is not Blood but Wine, and then I must have been constrain'd to grant it Lawful to drink Wine: But since it was only Wine in appearance, and Blood in reality my Cause is untouch'd. This is the way of Papists with Fathers; if they will not fairly serve their turn, they leave them in the Lurch, and suitable to the Transubstantiator's Original, in Theodoret, Eranista will be alway against Orthodoxus.

§. 47. What T. B. closes this Paragraph with needs no other Confutation than a Smile, that a Man may be made Drunk by mere Qualities, for he may as well be nourish'd by mere Accidents, which, if T. B's Diet for a while, would soon make him like his Food, a mere Phantom too.

§. 48. (4.) From St. Basil's Liturgy, I prov'd that the Fathers that us'd it, could not believe Transubstantiation, which calls the Elements after Consecration (*ἁγία*) correspondent Types. So do

do Roman Catholics (says T. B.) like enough I say, for they are a sort of Gentlemen, that exceed all the rest of Mankind in swallowing Absurdities glibly. But the Question is whether Roman Catholics call the Elements Types, in the Sense of the Greek Fathers, and whether that be consistent with Transubstantiation? And it will be no hard Matter to clear that Point. *Clemens Alexandrinus* in *Amos* c. 6. says, *A Type is not the Truth, but rather imports the Similitude of the Truth.* *St. Chrysostome*, *A Type is so* *Chrys. Hom. call'd till the Truth come; and after the Truth is come, it is no longer call'd a Type.* *Oecumenius*, *A Type is not in all Things equal to the Truth (for, if it were so, it would be the Truth it self, and so rather an Identity than a Type) but it hath some Images and Likenesses to it.* Is it not hence manifest, that when the Greek Fathers call the Elements Types, they understood Types in such a Sense, as made a real Distinction between them and Christ's Body, whereof they were Types. This was so manifest to *Epiphanius* the Deacon, in the *second Council of Nice*, that he denies the Eucharist to be call'd the Image or Type of Christ's Body after Consecration (tho' the contrary is apparent from *St. Basil's Liturgy*, quoted in my first Paper) For, says he, if it be an Image of his Body, it cannot be the Divine Body it self.

§. 49. *Damascene* also, who was one of the first Innovators in this Matter of the Eucharist, denies that the Bread and Wine are a Type and Figure of Christ's Body and Blood, but the very Body and Blood it self: And that when the Ancients call them Antitypes, they mean it is so before Consecration of the Elements, and not after. And tho' he were (as well as *Epiphanius*) mistaken in that, yet it shews he was sensible, that, according to the Sense of the Greek Fathers, the Eucharist could not after Consecration be a Type, and Christ's substantial Body too. To this add, That the Fathers were wont to oppose the Extravagancy of *Sabellius*, who acknowledg'd in the Divinity only one Person under three several Names, by this Maxim, that nothing hath Relation to it self: And so stop't his Mouth with this Argument, that the Father begetting the Son, and the Holy Ghost proceeding from both, these three Persons have such Relations, as must distinguish them, and will not suffer them to be one and the same Person. But doth not Transubstantiation enervate this Argument, which makes the same Thing to have Relation to it self, not only as the Producer, and the Thing produc'd, but also as the Type and Architype? Its manifest then that the Greek Fathers in calling the Elements Types, shew that they did not believe them chang'd into the Substance of Christ's Body and Blood, and that the Ro-

man Catholicks are very absurd, and inconsistent with themselves, who believe this Doctrine, and yet use that Term.

§. 50. And now I dare be bold to say, that every one of my Arguments stand firm, and are convincing Evidences against Transubstantiation, unshaken by T. B's. weak Answers: Weak I say, not no reflect upon his *Learning*, but his *Cause*, which no Learning can support.

§. 51. Before I conclude with T. B. I desire him to consider a

(5.) Fifth Argument to confirm my *Negative*, that the ancient Fathers did not believe a substantial Change in the Eucharist. From their disposal of their reserv'd Elements after the Communion was over. They did not reserve them for solemn Processions, and idolatrous Adoration as the Church of *Rome* does; but,

§. 52. 1. St. Hierom, on the Author of the Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles among his Works on these Words, 1 Cor. 11. *This is not to eat the Lord's Supper, &c. says, Meeting in the Church, they separately made their Oblations, and after the Communion, whatsoever remain'd of the Sacrifices, there in the Church eating (Communem cœnam) a common Supper they consum'd them together.*

§. 53. 2. After these common Suppers ceas'd, and that way of consuming the Elements with them, the ancient Church had another way mention'd by *Hesychius*, where explaining that place of the Law, which requir'd that *whatsoever of the Flesh, and Bread remain'd, should be burnt with Fire*, adds, *Which we see also now sensibly done in the Church, that whatsoever happens to remain (of the Eucharist) is thrown into the Fire.* Which Custom I shew'd, in an Appendix to my second Paper, was establish'd here in England by two several Canons.

§. 54. 3. *Evagrius* mentions another Usage in the Church of Constantinople, That when a great Deal of the holy parts of the immaculate Body of Christ our God remain'd, they sent for some Youths, that went to School of an unripe Age, to eat them up. And *Call. Hist. l. 2. 27. c. 25.* this he calls (*παλαιδιῶδες*) an ancient Custom, And *Nicephorus Callistus* says, That this continu'd to his time, and that he himself had been one of those Youths, that had eat up those remaining Particles. And from these Observations it is reasonable to conclude, that the ancient Church was so far from believing Transubstantiation, that they look'd on the Elements as no longer Sacramental, after the Communion was over. For if pompous Processions and Adorations be the proper Consequences of Transubstantiation, and if these Ancients had believ'd it, these Customs

Customs must have been censur'd and condemn'd as intollerable Prophanations of the Lord's Body.

S. 55. And now having at present done with T. B. I shall add a few Words to the Gentleman, for whose Information this is written.

S I R,

IT is a Common, tho' very weak and sophistical Argument made use of by Romish Priests, that their Communion is safer than ours, because they (uncharitable as they are) determine positively, that we cannot be Sav'd, and we (such is our great Charity) allow the Salvation of a Papist to be possible. Yet this however will not reach your Case, since tho' we hope as well as we can of a Papist prejudic'd by Education, and wanting means of better Information, especially when his Life is more Christian than his Principles, we cannot but declare this very Doctrin of Transubstantiation damnable in ev'ry one that adheres to it, against sufficient means of better Information. I beseech you then, nay, I charge you as you dare answer it at the dreadful Day of Judgment, that you suffer not the Prejudices of Education, the Aversion to confess an Error, the Respect to Relations, or any other secular Interest whatsoever, to shut out the Light of that Evidence, which hath been laid before you, that you abandon not your Reason, your Senses, and Scripture too in favour of this absurd Doctrin, which will unavoidably involve you as oft as you go to Mass, in Idolatry as gross as ever Heathens were Guilty of.

I am Confident, Sir, you are a Gentleman of too much Sense to believe heartily this absurd Doctrin. Take heed then of continuing to profess it, lest the stifling of your Convictions harden you into Infidelity and Scepticism. In a Word, If you will consider your true Interest, either as to this Life or the next (which are here inseparably connected with your Duty) you will speedily flee from the Abominations of the most corrupt-

ed part of the Christian Church, into the Communion of that part, which is most pure and agreeable to the Primitive Pattern in all her Doctrines and Constitutions. And hereby you will bring an inconceivable Joy to all that wisely and sincerely aim at your Good ; especially to

Your entirely Devoted

and Humble Servant,

H. N.

2 AP 63

F I N I S.

P O S T-

A
P O S T S C R I P T
T O T H E
R E A D E R.

JUST before I sent these Papers to the Press, T. B. sent me a Bundle of about an Hundred Pages with several Additions in the Margent, containing a pretended Answer to this last Paper, and to my Vindication of the Fathers, Paper the fourth in the First Part. In which, finding some Paragraphs at the beginning about the Case of Education, I transcrib'd it, and it makes the eighth Paper in the Introduction, which I have answer'd in the ninth. But the rest I had not Time to peruse, much less to Consider and Animadvert upon, in time, for this Impression; and it could not reasonably be expected, that I should have printed it without an Answer. I have since Read it, and find it as weak, but infinitely more unmannerly and scurrilous than any of T. B's. former Papers: So that I do not judge them worth Publishing. But if T. B. is of another Mind, and will be at the Charges to Print them himself, I will not fail to give a fair Answer to any Thing in it, that may seem to deserve it; and for the Scurrility it deserves no further Notice.

BOOKS Printed for John Wyat.

EXpository Notes with Practical Observations, on the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Wherein the sacred Text is at large recited, the Sense explain'd, and the instructive Example of the Blessed Jesus and his Holy Apostles to our Imitation recommended. The whole design'd to encourage the Reading of the Scriptures in private Families, and to render the daily Perusal of them Profitable and Delightful. Endeavour'd by *Will. Burkit*, late Vicar and Lecturer of *Dedham* in *Essex*. The Second Edition. Folio.

Family Instruction for the Church of *England*, offer'd in several Practical Discourses, by *Theophilus Dorrington*, Rector of *Witresham* in *Kent*.

Historia Sacra: Or, the Holy History; giving an Exact and Comprehensive Account of all the Feasts and Fasts of the Church of *England*, after a new and curious Method; with their various Etymologies and Appellations, and the true Reasons and Grounds of their Celebration; together with Practical Observations upon the several Days, and Prayers concluding each distinct Head. To which is added an Appendix, wherein the three Grand Solemnities last added to the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, are clearly Explain'd.

The Life of Pope *Sixtus V.* In which we have also (by pleasant Digressions) a View of the Transactions of the *Romish* Church, and the most considerable Affairs of *Europe* in that Age. Written in *Italian* by *Gregory Leti*.

An Essay towards a Vindication of the Vulgar Exposition of the *Mosaic* History of the Creation of the World, and of the Fall of *Adam* in Two Parts. By *J. Witty*, late of *St. John's* College in *Cambridge*.

Jesus and the Resurrection justify'd by Witnesses in Heaven and in Earth. In Two Parts. The first shewing that Jesus is the Son of God; The second, that in him we have Eternal Life. By *Simon Patrick*, D. D. now Lord Bishop of *Ely*, the Second Edition Revis'd by his Lordship.

A Modest Proof of the Order and Government settled by Christ and his Apostles in the Church. By shewing, 1. What sacred Offices were Instituted by them. 2. How those Offices were Distinguish'd 3. That they were to be Perpetual, and Standing in the Church. And 4. Who Succeed in them, and rightly Execute them to this Day; Recommended as proper to be put into the Hands of the Laity.

A short Discourse concerning the Common-Prayer, by way of Question and Answer, giving an Account of the Reasonableness of it, and removing some common Objections made against it. By a Minister of the Church of *England* for the use of his Parishioners. Price 3d.

The Necessity of coming to Church, and the due Performance of Holy Worship there: Demonstrated in a Dialogue, or Friendly Conference. Written, and intended for the use of those Absenters, who continue within the Pale of the Church of *England*. By a Member of the same. Second Edition. Price 2d.

